



4mo

Toronto University Library

Presented by

The Right Honorable J. J. Ball Esq  
L. L. D., D. C. L.  
through the Committee formed in  
The Old Country  
to aid in replacing the loss caused by  
The disastrous Fire of February the 14<sup>th</sup> 1890





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



Recd.  
B.

THE

REFORMED CHURCH

OF

I R E L A N D

(1537-1889)

BY THE RIGHT HON.

J. T. BALL, LL.D., D.C.L.

SECOND EDITION REVISED.

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

AND NEW YORK: 13, EAST 16<sup>th</sup> STREET.

DUBLIN:

HODGES, FIGGIS, AND CO.

1890.



*Printed at THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Dublin.*

13382

6

## PREFACE.

---

OF THE CHURCHES in which during the sixteenth century, either by legislative interference or their own voluntary action, the principles of the Reformation were introduced, none can claim attention more justly than the Church then established in Ireland. Its history has been traced to the time of the Union with accuracy and minuteness; but of subsequent events, although some (for instance, Disestablishment and the construction of a new Constitution) are of the highest importance, a narrative is yet wanting. The following pages are an attempt to supply this deficiency; they also aim at recalling what has been already discussed by others, but in a compressed form, and without details which no longer instruct or interest. Opinions, as they have prevailed within the Church, the eminent persons by whom they have been supported, and the reasons which have been assigned for them, necessarily come under consideration, but merely historically, and with no design of taking part

in the controversies which have arisen in reference to theological questions. Other denominations of religion contemporaneously existing in Ireland, their systems and proceedings, and in like manner the general history of the country, are noticed only so far as was required for the purposes of the narrative.

DECEMBER, 1886.

---

IN the new edition now issued I have endeavoured to correct the errors, and to supply some at least of the defects, which were either pointed out in criticisms of the former edition, or perceived by myself upon re-examination. Notes and observations formerly inserted in relation to the Irish Parliament I have withdrawn, having, since they were written, treated the subjects discussed in them more fully in another treatise. Their withdrawal has enabled the introduction of new matter with little increase in the size of the book. Some other alterations have also been made of which the principal are, that the statistics of the financial condition of the Church have been brought down to the date of 1889, instead of, as before, of 1885; and that there has been added an account to the same date of the actual application by Parliament

of the surplus of the property, which had prior to the Act of 1869 belonged to the Church, remaining after answering the charges imposed upon it by that statute.

It may, perhaps, be proper to take this opportunity of stating that to some extent the narrative of incidents immediately before and subsequent to disestablishment, is founded upon personal observation, for which the following circumstance furnished occasion. In 1862 I was appointed by Archbishop Beresford (then the Primate of the Irish Church) Vicar-General of the Province of Armagh, and was thus brought into relations of confidential communication with him respecting ecclesiastical affairs—relations which were not interrupted by my having filled the office of Chancellor in Ireland from 1875 to 1880, and which continued until his death in 1886. With the Parliamentary proceedings also which eventuated in the legislation of 1869 I necessarily came in contact, as I was during their occurrence a representative in the House of Commons for the University of Dublin.

AUGUST, 1890.

“It is very true that these ecclesiastical matters are things not properly appertaining to my profession, which I was not so inconsiderate but to object to myself; but finding that it is many times seen that a man that standeth off, and somewhat removed from a plot of ground, doth better survey it and discover it than those which are upon it, I thought it not impossible but that I, as a looker on, might cast mine eyes upon some things which the actors themselves, especially some being interested, some led and addicted, some declared and engaged, did not or would not see.”—BACON.



# CONTENTS.



## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
Scope of the present Treatise, . . . . .	1
Ecclesiastical policy in Ireland in the reign of Henry VIII. directed from England, . . . . .	1
Reformation Movement in England at that time, . . . . .	2
State of Society in England at that time, . . . . .	2
Improved condition and increased power of the English Laity, . . . . .	3
Effect on their opinions, . . . . .	3
Discontent caused by the internal condition of the Church in England, . . . . .	4
State of the Parochial Clergy in England, . . . . .	4
State of the Religious Houses in England, . . . . .	5
The Laity become estranged from the Clergy in England, . . . . .	7
Reformation in Germany, . . . . .	8
Wolsey's policy, . . . . .	8
Henry VIII. takes part with the Reformers, . . . . .	9
Previous ecclesiastical statutes, . . . . .	10
The King claims to be "Supreme Head of the Church," . . . . .	11
Object of the claim to this title, . . . . .	12
A spiritual meaning in it disclaimed, . . . . .	12
Admission of "the Headship" with a qualification by the two English Convocations, . . . . .	13
English Statute "in Restraint of Appeals," . . . . .	14
English Statute in relation to Convocation, "Act of Submission," . . . . .	14
English Supremacy Act, November, 1534, . . . . .	15
Down to that date, no legislation in England as to doctrine, . . . . .	16



## CHAPTER II.

[1535-1547.]

	PAGE
The Reformation Movement of the Sixteenth Century did not extend itself to Ireland, . . . . .	17
Relations then held to exist between England and Ireland, . . . .	17
Supposed jurisdiction of the Crown in both countries the same, . . .	17
In 1535, Henry VIII. proceeds to have the Supremacy of the Crown in the Church acknowledged in Ireland, . . . . .	18
Henry appoints George Browne Archbishop of Dublin, . . . . .	19
Commission to Archbishop Browne and others, directing them to obtain the admission of the King's Supremacy in Ireland, . . . . .	19
Opposition in Ireland to Henry's ecclesiastical policy, . . . . .	20
Letter from Archbishop Browne to Cromwell recommending a Parliament to be called, . . . . .	20
Separation at this time of the Irish People into two divisions, . . .	20
Constitution of the Irish Parliament, . . . . .	21
No Convocation as yet in Ireland, . . . . .	21
Proctors sent by the Clergy to attend Parliament, . . . . .	21
Irish Parliament met in May, 1536, . . . . .	22
Statute to declare that the Proctors had no right to vote, . . . .	22
The Commons favourable to the Supremacy, . . . . .	22
Opposition to the Supremacy among the Lords, . . . . .	23
Speech of Archbishop Browne in the House of Lords, . . . . .	23
Irish Supremacy Act passed : its nature, . . . . .	23
Other Ecclesiastical Statutes also passed, . . . . .	24
Effect of this Legislation confined to the English districts, . . . .	25
Condition of the Irish districts, . . . . .	25
Condition of the Pale, . . . . .	26
Act to change the King's style from " Lord " to " King " of Ireland, .	27
After this Act a policy of conciliation adopted, . . . . .	28
Influence of the Crown in Ireland increased, . . . . .	28
Neglect of missionary exertions to introduce the Reformation among the native Irish, . . . . .	28
The Bishops in the Pale favoured the Reformation, . . . . .	29
How far there was Doctrinal Reformation in Henry's reign, . . . .	30
Archbishop Browne's " Form of Beads," . . . . .	30
First Fruits and Twentieths in Ireland given to the Crown, . . . .	32
Religious Houses in Ireland dissolved, . . . . .	32
No Legislation at this time as to Convocations or Synods in Ireland, .	32
Appointments to vacant Bishopsrics in Ireland after the Supremacy Act, .	33

## CHAPTER III.

[1547-1553.]

	PAGE
Accession of Edward VI., . . . . .	34
The King educated as a Protestant, . . . . .	34
Revision of Liturgies determined upon, . . . . .	35
Various Latin Services in use in England, . . . . .	35
Services in use in Ireland, . . . . .	36
An English Prayer-book enacted by the English Parliament, . . . . .	37
The English Prayer-book introduced into the Church in Ireland under the authority of a Letter from the King, . . . . .	38
St. Leger, the Lord Deputy, summons an Assembly of Bishops and Clergy to consider the King's Letter, . . . . .	38
Meeting and proceedings of the Assembly, . . . . .	39
Proclamation to require the use of the Prayer-book, . . . . .	40
Edward's first Prayer-book differs from the present English Prayer-book, . . . . .	41
Sources from which the Services adopted in the Prayer-book were derived, . . . . .	43
St. Leger recalled and replaced by Crofts, . . . . .	44
Conference of Crofts with Archbishop Dowdall, . . . . .	45
Primacy transferred from Armagh to Dublin, . . . . .	45
Archbishop Dowdall leaves the country, . . . . .	45
Goodacre appointed in the room of Dowdall, . . . . .	45
Consecration of Goodacre as Archbishop of Armagh, and of Bale as Bishop of Ossory, according to the English form, . . . . .	45
Appointment of other Bishops in Ireland by the King, . . . . .	45
Edward's first Prayer-book printed in Dublin, . . . . .	46
Irish Version ordered, but not made, . . . . .	46
Second English Prayer-book of Edward VI., . . . . .	46
Civil affairs in Edward's reign, . . . . .	49

## CHAPTER IV.

[1553-1558.]

Accession of Queen Mary, . . . . .	50
The Queen re-establishes the Church of Rome, . . . . .	51
Restoration of Dowdall to the See of Armagh, . . . . .	51
Some Irish Bishops deprived: others fled, . . . . .	52
Appointments in the room of the Bishops deprived, . . . . .	52
Death and character of Archbishop Browne, . . . . .	53
Bull of Paul IV. pronouncing absolution for the separation from Rome, . . . . .	54
Repeal of the ecclesiastical statutes of Henry VIII., . . . . .	54
No persecution in Ireland for religion, . . . . .	55

	PAGE
Commission for the purpose alleged to have been issued, . . . . .	55
Civil affairs in Mary's reign in Ireland, . . . . .	55
The "Plantation" system introduced, . . . . .	56
King's and Queen's Counties formed and planted, . . . . .	56
Statute to facilitate the formation of counties, . . . . .	57
Effect of the civil policy initiated at this time, . . . . .	58

## CHAPTER V.

[1558-1603.]

Accession of Queen Elizabeth, . . . . .	60
Numerical proportion of Roman Catholics and Protestants in England, . . . . .	60
Protestant influence in Elizabeth's first English Parliament, . . . . .	61
English Supremacy Act of Elizabeth, . . . . .	61
Elizabeth's objection to be called "Head of the Church," . . . . .	62
Substitution in the Oath of Supremacy of the words "Governor," &c., for "Head of the Church," . . . . .	62
Heresy defined, . . . . .	62
Supremacy explained, . . . . .	63
Elizabeth's English Prayer-book, . . . . .	64
Irish Parliament summoned, and met in 1560, . . . . .	65
How composed, . . . . .	65
Acts of the Irish Parliament of 1560, . . . . .	66
Irish Supremacy Act, . . . . .	66
Irish Act directing the use of Elizabeth's English Prayer-book, . . . . .	67
Other Irish Ecclesiastical Acts, . . . . .	68
Meeting of Clergy in Ireland called by Lord Sussex, the Deputy, . . . . .	70
Proceedings at the meeting of Clergy, . . . . .	70
Leverous, Bishop of Kildare, and Walsh, Bishop of Meath, deprived, . . . . .	71
Conduct of other Bishops, . . . . .	71
Appointments of Bishops, . . . . .	73
Conflicting appointments by the Queen and the Popes, . . . . .	74
The new Services used near Dublin, . . . . .	75
How far the Statutes relating to religion were enforced, . . . . .	76
The Thirty-nine Articles enacted in England, . . . . .	77
In Ireland a different set of Articles, Eleven in number, enjoined, . . . . .	77
Nature of "the Eleven Articles," . . . . .	78
"Free Schools" established, . . . . .	79
Foundation of Trinity College, Dublin, . . . . .	79
Civil affairs in Elizabeth's reign, . . . . .	81
Wars and insurrections in Ireland, . . . . .	81
Final establishment of English authority, . . . . .	82
New Counties formed, . . . . .	83
Colonization of Ards and Munster, . . . . .	83
Other colonization, . . . . .	84

## CHAPTER VI.

## RETROSPECT.

	PAGE
State of the Irish Church in 1536, . . . . .	85
Division among the clergy owing to nationality, . . . . .	86
Increased by legislation, . . . . .	86
Organization of the Church, . . . . .	88
Clergy monastic as well as secular, . . . . .	88
Influence of the Religious Houses, . . . . .	89
Evil effect of their appropriations, . . . . .	90
Condition of the clergy, . . . . .	90
Policy adopted as to appropriations, . . . . .	91
No improvement in the state of the clergy, . . . . .	93
Sir Henry Sidney's letter to Queen Elizabeth, . . . . .	94
Spenser's description of the clergy, . . . . .	95
How far Protestantism made progress, . . . . .	96
No exertion to instruct the natives, . . . . .	97
The majority of the Anglo-Irish become Protestant, . . . . .	100

## CHAPTER VII.

[1603-1625.]

Accession of James I., . . . . .	101
General submission in Ireland to the authority of James, . . . . .	101
Change of policy in civil affairs, . . . . .	101
Circuits of the Judges enlarged, . . . . .	102
Irish Chieftains accept grants from the Crown, . . . . .	102
Tyrone and Tyrconnell leave the Kingdom, . . . . .	103
Forfeiture of the territories of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, . . . . .	103
Plantation of Ulster, . . . . .	104
Majority of the new settlers Scotch, . . . . .	105
Parliament summoned, and met in 1613, . . . . .	106
Constitution of the Parliament of 1613, . . . . .	106
Sir John Davis elected Speaker, . . . . .	106
His Address to the Deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester, . . . . .	107
Repeal of Statutes which depressed the Irish, . . . . .	108



	PAGE
First Convocation in Ireland, . . . . .	108
Convocation proceeds to frame Articles of Faith, . . . . .	110
Irish Articles of 1615, . . . . .	112
Less religious toleration in Ireland under James than under Elizabeth, . . . . .	116
Proceedings of James in reference to ecclesiastical affairs, . . . . .	117
Episcopal appointments in the Irish Church by James, . . . . .	117
Ussher (James) appointed to Meath, thence to Armagh, . . . . .	117
Hampton, Archbishop of Armagh, . . . . .	117
Downham, Bishop of Derry, . . . . .	119
Effect of the King's measures, . . . . .	120

## CHAPTER VIII.

[1625-1660.]

Religious controversies in England at the Accession of Charles I., . . . .	122
Increased power of the Puritan party, . . . . .	124
Political dissensions in England, . . . . .	124
Troubles in Ireland, . . . . .	124
Want of clerical discipline, . . . . .	125
Letter of Charles reproving the condition of the Church in Ireland, . . . . .	125
Strafford appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, . . . . .	126
Bramhall accompanies Strafford to Ireland, . . . . .	126
Condition of the Church in Ireland, . . . . .	127
Measures of Strafford for the benefit of the Church, . . . . .	127
Strafford and Bramhall desire to introduce the English Articles in Ireland, . . . . .	128
The Irish Convocation meets in 1634, . . . . .	128
Bramhall proposes the adoption of the English Articles, . . . . .	129
Adoption of the English Articles by the Irish Convocation, . . . . .	129
The Irish Articles of 1613 not expressly repealed, . . . . .	131
Course pursued by Convocation as to the Canons, . . . . .	131
Statutes affecting the Church, . . . . .	132
Removal of Strafford (1640), . . . . .	132
Rebellion of 1641, . . . . .	133
Effect of the Rebellion of 1641 on the Church, . . . . .	134
Westminster Assembly, . . . . .	135
The Solemn League and Covenant, . . . . .	136
The Westminster Directory, &c., . . . . .	137
Prohibition in Ireland of the use of the Prayer-book, . . . . .	138
Vacant bishoprics not filled, . . . . .	139

## CHAPTER IX.

## USSHER AND BEDELL.

	PAGE
Death of Archbishop Ussher, . . . . .	140
Incidents of his life, . . . . .	140
Character of Ussher as a Bishop, . . . . .	141
Joins Charles I. and defends Episcopacy, . . . . .	142
Ussher's opinions as to the nature of the Episcopal office, . . . . .	143
Compromise of the controversy as to Episcopacy suggested by Ussher, . . . . .	144
Learning and opinions of Ussher, . . . . .	145
Ussher's personal character, . . . . .	147
Bishop Bedell, . . . . .	148
State of Bedell's Dioceses, . . . . .	148
Bedell's character, &c., . . . . .	149

## CHAPTER X.

[1660-1685.]

Rule of the Commonwealth in Ireland, . . . . .	151
Transplantation of the natives to Connaught, . . . . .	151
Colonization, . . . . .	152
Effect of colonization on the interests of the Church, . . . . .	153
Re-establishment of the Church in Ireland by Charles II., . . . .	154
Bramhall appointed Archbishop of Armagh, . . . . .	155
Consecration of two Archbishops and ten Bishops, . . . . .	155
Jeremy Taylor, . . . . .	156
Taylor preaches the Consecration Sermon, . . . . .	157
The Irish Parliament meets, . . . . .	158
Taylor preaches before Parliament, . . . . .	159
Proceedings of the House of Commons, . . . . .	159
Claims of the Presbyterian Clergy, . . . . .	159
English and Irish Uniformity Acts, . . . . .	161
Position of the Presbyterian Clergy in Ireland before the Uniformity Act, . . . . .	161
Revision of the English Prayer-book, . . . . .	162
The Prayer Book as revised in England adopted in Ireland, . . . . .	163
Changes introduced in the Prayer-book, . . . . .	164
Additions in Ireland to the English Services, . . . . .	165
Death of Bramhall; his character, . . . . .	166
Margetson succeeds him, . . . . .	166
Acts of Settlement and Explanation, . . . . .	167

## CHAPTER XI.

[1685-1702.]

	PAGE
Policy of the English Government in Ireland before 1685, . . .	168
Policy of James II., . . . . .	168
Different results of his policy in England and Ireland, . . .	169
Abdication of James, . . . . .	169
The Crown conferred in England upon William and Mary, . . .	169
Ascendency of the Roman Catholic interest in Ireland, . . .	169
Parliament called by James in Ireland (1689), . . . . .	170
Acts of the Parliament called by James, . . . . .	170
Success of William's army, . . . . .	171
The Established Church restored to its former position, . . .	171
Vacant Bishoprics filled, . . . . .	171
The Irish Convocation not summoned by William and Mary or by William,	172
The Clergy taxed by Parliament in Ireland, . . . . .	172
Non-Jurors in England and Ireland, . . . . .	173
Charles Leslie, . . . . .	173
Acts of the Irish Parliament relating to ecclesiastical affairs, . . .	174
Primate Boyle, . . . . .	174
Bishop Hacket deprived, . . . . .	174
Beginning of the Penal Code, . . . . .	175
Assertion by the English Parliament of a right to legislate for Ireland, . .	176
Discontent in Ireland, . . . . .	176
Molyneux's "Case of Ireland," &c., . . . . .	177

## CHAPTER XII.

[1702-1714.]

Penal Code for Ireland much added to in the reign of Queen Anne, . .	178
Provisions of the Irish Penal Code, . . . . .	178
Injurious effects of the Penal Code upon the Interests of Protestantism in Ireland, . . . . .	179
Impolitic laws as to Protestant Dissenters in Ireland, . . . .	180
Neglect of the real interests of the Church by the Irish Parliament, . .	181
First Fruits and Twentieths restored by the Queen, . . . .	181
Swift represents to her the depressed condition of the Church, . . .	181
Convocation again summoned along with Parliament, . . . .	183
Resolution of the Lower House in reference to the conversion of the native Irish, . . . . .	183



# CONTENTS.

xv

	PAGE
Proceedings of Convocation in 1705, 1709, 1711, . . . . .	184
The Crown ceases to summon Convocation in Ireland, . . . . .	185
Considerations which discouraged exertions to convert the natives, . . . . .	187
Measures adopted for the purpose of converting the natives, . . . . .	187
Vacancies in Bishoprics filled, . . . . .	188
Primates Marsh and Lindsay, . . . . .	188
Archbishop King, . . . . .	188
Bishop Stearne, . . . . .	189
Neglect of duty by many Bishops, . . . . .	190
Effects of the Penal Code, . . . . .	190
Protestant Ascendency completely established, . . . . .	191

## CHAPTER XIII.

[1714-1760.]

Social condition of Ireland during the reigns of George I. and George II.,	192
Religious condition of England and Ireland at the commencement of the eighteenth century, . . . . .	192
Prevalence of infidelity, . . . . .	193
Standard of opinion in society irrespective of religion, . . . . .	194
English and Irish clergy, . . . . .	195
Peculiar circumstances injuriously affecting the Irish Clergy, . . . . .	195
Objectionable mode in which the ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown was exercised in Ireland, . . . . .	196
High standard of merit of some of the Irish Clergy, . . . . .	196
The questions debated at this time related to the truth and authority of revealed religion, . . . . .	196
Archbishop King's writings, . . . . .	197
Bishop Peter Browne's writings, . . . . .	198
Bishop Berkeley, . . . . .	200
The writings of Berkeley, . . . . .	201
Abbadie, Dean of Killaloe, . . . . .	203
Controversy between Bishops Browne and Berkeley on the moral attri- butes of a Supreme Being, . . . . .	204
English and Irish parties in the State and the Church, . . . . .	205
English policy in Ireland, . . . . .	205
Swift, . . . . .	207
Swift's "Sentiments of a Church of England Man," and Sermons, . . . . .	208

## CHAPTER XIV.

[1760-1800.]

	PAGE
Revival of a religious spirit before the accession of George III., . . . .	210
Its revival principally due to Wesley and his associates, . . . .	210
Wesley adhered to the Church both in England and Ireland, . . . .	211
Introduction and progress of Methodism in Ireland, . . . .	211
The Evangelical party in the English and Irish Churches, . . . .	213
Improvement of manners in England and Ireland, . . . .	213
Improvement of the clergy, . . . . .	214
Patronage of the Crown still too much guided by political motives, . .	214
Primate Stone, . . . . .	214
Bishop Hervey (Earl of Bristol), . . . . .	216
Character of other Irish Bishops, . . . . .	217
Non-residence of many of the beneficed clergy in Ireland, . . . .	218
The Irish Parliament relaxes the Penal Code, . . . . .	218
It neglects to legislate for the Church, . . . . .	218
Primate Boulter, . . . . .	219
Primate Robinson (Lord Rokeby), . . . . .	220
Bishop Law (John), . . . . .	221
Bishop Rundle, . . . . .	224
Bishop Percy, . . . . .	225
Bishop O'Beirne, . . . . .	225
Bishops Hamilton and Young, . . . . .	226
Kirwan, . . . . .	226
Primate Newcome, . . . . .	227

## CHAPTER XV.

## THE UNION.

Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, . . . . .	228
Union of the Churches of England and Ireland, . . . . .	228
Act 6 George I., declaring the right of the English Parliament to legis- late for Ireland, . . . . .	228
Effects of the Act 6 Geo. I. and of Poynings' Law, . . . . .	229
Swift revives Molyneux's protest against the English Parliament legis- lating for Ireland, . . . . .	230
Patriotic movement, . . . . .	230

# CONTENTS.

xvii

	PAGE
New Parliament at the accession of George III., . . . . .	231
It reflects the popular sentiments, . . . . .	231
The Volunteers (1778), . . . . .	231
Concessions to the popular party as to trade, . . . . .	231
Act 6 Geo. I. repealed (1782), . . . . .	232
Poynings' Law modified, . . . . .	232
Effect of these concessions, . . . . .	233
Disagreements between the English and Irish Parliaments, . . . .	233
The policy of uniting the kingdoms of England and Ireland begins to be favoured, . . . . .	234
Union also of the Churches of England and Ireland approved, . . .	235
Act of Union (1800), . . . . .	236
No national Synod or Convocation summoned either in England or Ireland to consider the union of the Churches, . . . . .	238

## CHAPTER XVI.

[1800-1838.]

For nearly thirty years after the Union the position of the Irish Church seemed secure, . . . . .	239
Causes tending to disturb its security, . . . . .	240
Catholic Emancipation intended by Pitt, but prevented by George III., .	240
Emancipation Act not passed until 1829, . . . . .	240
Effect of delay in granting Emancipation, . . . . .	240
Emancipation Act preceded and followed by agitation, . . . . .	240
Agitation is turned against the Establishment, . . . . .	242
Tithe system, evils of, . . . . .	242
Tithe Composition not compulsory until 1832, . . . . .	244
Royal Commission to inquire into the revenues of the Established Church in Ireland (1832), . . . . .	244
Church Temporalities Acts (Ireland) (1833, 1834), . . . . .	244
Tithe Rentcharge Act (Ireland) (1838), . . . . .	245
Objections made to the Irish Church Establishment, . . . . .	246
Arguments of those who opposed the establishment of Churches, . . .	247
Answer of those who supported Establishments, . . . . .	247
Endowment of Churches also objected to, . . . . .	249
Defended because voluntary system inadequate to meet the religious needs of society, . . . . .	249
The Establishment in Ireland exposed to objections peculiar to itself, .	250
Considerations which operated to abate the force of the objections to the Irish Establishment, . . . . .	250

## CHAPTER XVII.

[1838-1869.]

	PAGE
From 1838 until 1861 opposition to the Church Establishment in Ireland	
inactive, . . . . .	252
Census of 1861 first ascertained the religious profession of the people, .	253
Disproportion between the number of members of the Established Church	
and that of the whole people, . . . . .	253
Arguments against the Establishment in Ireland founded on the Census, .	253
Failure to convert the native Irish to Protestantism, . . . . .	253
Delay in proceeding against the Church in Parliament after the Census of	
1861, . . . . .	254
Question of the Irish Church moved in the House of Lords (1867), .	254
Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of the Irish Church issued	
(1867), . . . . .	255
In 1868 the question of the Irish Church brought forward in the House of	
Commons, . . . . .	256
Resolutions and a Bill to suspend appointments in the Church of Ireland,	
carried in the House of Commons, . . . . .	256
Bill to suspend appointments in the Church moved in the House of Lords,	
and rejected, . . . . .	257
Report of the Commission to inquire into the Irish Church, . . . . .	258
Dissolution of Parliament (1868), . . . . .	259
Irish Church Act (1869), . . . . .	259
Provisions of the Irish Church Act, . . . . .	260

## CHAPTER XVIII.

[1800-1869.]

Improvement in the state of society in England and Ireland for some	
time before the nineteenth century, . . . . .	264
Effect on the Irish Established Church, . . . . .	265
Revival of discussion on doctrinal subjects, . . . . .	265
Doctrinal views prevalent in the Irish Church before 1634, . . . . .	266
Views prevalent after 1634, . . . . .	267
Downham and Jeremy Taylor cited, . . . . .	267
The Evangelical party become especially prominent, . . . . .	269
Differences among the laity and clergy of the Established Church in	
Ireland as to Education, . . . . .	271
Decay of party spirit before Disestablishment, . . . . .	272

# CONTENTS.

xix

	PAGE
Improvement in the Divinity School of Dublin University, . . . . .	273
High esteem in which the Irish Clergy were held, . . . . .	273
Improvement in the exercise of ecclesiastical patronage by the Crown, . . . . .	274
Theological works by Irish Ecclesiastics of this period noticed, . . . . .	275
Archbishop Magee's Treatise upon <i>The Atonement</i> , . . . . .	275
Bishop O'Brien's "Sermons upon the nature and effects of Faith," . . . . .	277
Alexander Knox and his opinions, . . . . .	278
Bishop Jebb, . . . . .	279
Oxford <i>Tracts for the Times</i> published, . . . . .	279
Not received with favour in Ireland, . . . . .	280
Answered in Whately's <i>Cautions for the Times</i> , . . . . .	280
Archbishop Whately's other writings, . . . . .	280
Professor Archer Butler on <i>Church Principles</i> , . . . . .	283
Dean Graves's <i>Lectures on the Pentateuch</i> , . . . . .	284
Bampton Lectures of Archbishop Laurence, . . . . .	284
Writings of Bishop Mant, . . . . .	285

## CHAPTER XIX.

[1869-1871.]

If the Disestablished Church were to be continued, provisions for the purpose necessary, . . . . .	286
Operation of the Irish Church Act in rendering the holding of Convocation or a General Synod legal without licence from the Crown, . . . . .	287
The Archbishops summon Convocation, . . . . .	288
Meeting of Convocation, . . . . .	288
Arrangement of the Episcopate at this period, . . . . .	289
Constitution of the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation, . . . . .	289
Proceedings of Convocation, . . . . .	290
Resolution passed by Convocation to invite the co-operation of the laity, . . . . .	290
Convocation makes rules to regulate the representation of the clergy in a Convention of clergy and laity, . . . . .	291
Influential laymen request a Lay Conference to be summoned by the Archbishops, . . . . .	291
Lay Conference summoned, . . . . .	292
Meeting and proceedings of the Lay Conference, . . . . .	292
Convention, or General Synod of clergy and laity summoned, . . . . .	293
Subjects requiring immediate decision by the Convention, . . . . .	293
Meeting of the Convention (February, 1870), . . . . .	294
Constitution of the Church framed by the Convention, . . . . .	294
Important Preface to the Constitution, . . . . .	295
Provisions of the Constitution, . . . . .	296
Incorporation of a Representative Body to hold property, . . . . .	299



## CHAPTER XX.

[1871-1889.]

	PAGE
Power given by the Irish Church Act for ecclesiastical persons to commute such life estates as it preserved for them for annuities, . . . . .	302
Power to vest in the Representative Body a fund to pay all clerical annuities, if the clergy agree, . . . . .	302
The bishops and clergy agree, . . . . .	303
The capitalized value of the annuities of the clergy vested in the Representative Body charged with the annuities, . . . . .	303
Annual subscriptions towards future maintenance of the clergy, . . . .	304
Power given by the Irish Church Act to the Representative Body to contract for retirement of the clergy from duty, . . . . .	304
Retirement of the clergy permitted on conditions as to the application of the commuting capital, . . . . .	304
Purchase of the Glebe Houses and portions of the Glebes by the Representative Body, . . . . .	305
Changes in the organization of the Church, . . . . .	306
Revision of the Prayer Book by the General Synod, . . . . .	306
Canons enacted, . . . . .	306
Observations upon the present position of the Disestablished Church, . .	310

## APPENDIX :—

Notes and Illustrations, . . . . .	313
------------------------------------	-----

INDEX, . . . . .	365
------------------	-----

## CORRIGENDA.

Page 139, in the list of Sees vacant at the death of Charles I. *add* Tuam; in page 146, first note, line 4, *for* Rowell's *read* Nowell's; in page 186, note, *for* services preached *read* sermons preached; in page 238, line 5, *for* 1616 *read* 1615; in page 251, line 4, *for* offensive *read* oppressive; in page 305, line 25, *for* amount *read* account; in page 318, line 32, *for* latter *read* letter.

# THE REFORMED CHURCH OF IRELAND.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTION.

MORE than three hundred and fifty years have now (A. D. 1889) elapsed since the statutes, which in the reign of Henry the Eighth separated the Church of Ireland from the See of Rome, were enacted by the Irish Parliament. It is proposed in the following pages to examine the nature of this legislation, the circumstances connected with it, and the more important incidents in the subsequent history of the Church as it was thenceforward constituted. But, as at the commencement of the period with which we shall be concerned ecclesiastical policy in Ireland was directed from England, and influenced rather by the relations supposed to exist between the two countries than by local circumstances, any investigation of the subjects to be considered would be imperfect which left unnoticed previous proceedings of the English Parliament in relation to the Church of England, and the occurrences and transactions in which they originated. A brief account of these events will therefore occupy the remainder of this chapter.



The movement, which in the early part of the sixteenth century was directed to obtain a reformation of the religious system then established in most European kingdoms, commenced in Germany, and thence extended itself to England. There it found controversies in relation to the Church, its discipline, and doctrine, already prevalent. These had been originated about one hundred and fifty years before by Wycliffe and his followers. Subsequently repressed, but never entirely extinguished, they owed their revival at this period to conditions of society which at a somewhat earlier date had come into existence.

During the reign of Henry VII. (1485–1509) considerable changes were effected in the positions which different classes of the English people occupied in the community, and in their relations between themselves. It was the interest of this monarch to depress the power of the nobility, and, accordingly, his policy was on every occasion directed to attain that object. He found political influence almost altogether in the hands of a few, on whom high rank and the paramount ownership of extensive territories had conferred it; and he desired, as a counterpoise to this undue ascendancy, to improve the condition and raise the station of the Commons. Under him, as the result partly of express laws and partly of judicial decisions, the power of barring entails of land was established, and thus the alienation and subdivision of this species of property, and so the introduction of new owners of it, were rendered practicable. At the same time commerce flourished, and, extending itself widely, supplied new sources of opulence for the merchants and traders. Contemporaneously a

great improvement in the system of education pursued in the Universities and Schools of England was going forward; the range of instruction in the former, long narrowed from excessive reverence for the Schoolmen, being now liberalized and expanded by study of the great writers of antiquity, and the teaching of the latter following, and being elevated by, the example thus set before them. Owing to these concurring causes a lay middle class, remarkable for its energy, enterprise, and intelligence, was gradually formed, and had about the time of the accession of Henry VIII. become of great importance.

Change in the constitution and character of society was accompanied by change in its sentiments and opinions. Previously the influence of the nobles and ecclesiastics of high rank was predominant, and the general body of the people were content to reflect their views. As long as this was the case innovation was discouraged; for those on whom the existing system conferred pre-eminence and power, either in the Church or the State, had no reason to desire alteration. But with the class that now became prominent it was otherwise; among them ideas of a different nature prevailed. They found themselves advanced in the social scale beyond what had been reached by their forefathers. They saw that in their own case change had been followed by improvement, and they were consequently prompted to try whether, in relation to other matters, similar results might not in like manner be obtained. A spirit of inquiry—a desire to bring received notions to the tests of reasoning and of more accurate information than the imperfect research of the past had

brought to light—gave a new direction to their thoughts and studies. Political and ecclesiastical institutions were no longer accepted merely because they had been established; on the contrary, their nature and condition were accurately scrutinized, and subjected to severe criticism—the results of which, as printing had then for some time been brought into use in England, were at once made public.

Increase of power and of mental activity on the part of the laity came in contact with a condition of affairs in the English Church which it was impossible to observe without extreme dissatisfaction. In the lapse of time abuses had grown up, and inserted themselves in the administration of its revenues and patronage. Monasteries had appropriated the emoluments of numbers of valuable benefices; unions and pluralities abounded; so that a favoured few held many rectories, conferred upon them without regard to the needs of the parishioners, and notwithstanding that their importance in the ecclesiastical system, their remoteness from each other, or other circumstances proper to be taken into account, required that they should be filled with separate incumbents. By these means the parochial clergy were impoverished, and reduced below the rank properly belonging to their order. They were, therefore, taken from an inferior class. Uneducated, rude in manner, engrossed with the mean cares incident to a poor estate, they differed in no respect from the uncultivated population whom they were appointed to teach. At the same time, in striking contrast to their humiliation, appeared the wealth and grandeur of a small number of ecclesiastics whom the appropriations and pluralities enriched. The



bishops, the cathedral dignitaries, the superiors of the greater Religious Houses, vied with the laity of highest rank in expensive and luxurious habits. Exceptions, no doubt, there were among them—men learned, pious, devoted to the duties of their calling; but much the larger proportion gave their exclusive attention to secular affairs, and were wholly engaged either in the pursuits of ambition, or with worldly pleasures and enjoyments.

The discontent necessarily growing from these circumstances was augmented by the nature of the endowments thus withdrawn from the parishes. Tithes, which formed the greater part of them, were a tax upon the owners and occupiers of land, originally imposed for purposes directly and immediately connected with the localities where they were levied, intended especially for the becoming maintenance of religious ministration among the people inhabiting them. Under the system of appropriations and pluralities, those who paid the tithes, and were entitled to reap any benefit resulting from them, saw them in these cases diverted to uses from which they themselves could derive no profit, and, in the instance of the pluralities, very frequently enjoyed by persons who reflected little credit on the Church over which they had been elevated.

Equal offence was given by the general condition of the Monastic Orders. From the bounty of successive generations, and from parochial revenues becoming vested in them, they had accumulated an amount of property, real and personal, which the laity, burdened with charges from which these bodies were exempt, regarded as exorbitant. Great as it was, it was likely to be still greater from the continued operation of the same causes

as had already produced, and still, despite the mutations of society, preserved their possessions. Compensating services long averted from the Religious Houses the envy which follows excessive wealth; but many years had elapsed since the return which they made to the community for the benefits they had received could be considered adequate. Designed to form the retreats of learning and piety, most of these institutions had ceased to answer the ends of their foundation; their inmates usually passing their lives in mere indolence and self-indulgence. At this period in England,—indeed in every part of Europe—the popular estimate of the monks, their character and conduct, was unfavourable.

So far as has been stated—so far as regards the misappropriation of the revenues of the Church, a general relaxation of discipline within it, worldliness and neglect of their sacred duties on the part of clerical persons, whether secular or monastic—there is little disagreement in the accounts which have reached us of the state of the Church of England during the first thirty years of the sixteenth century. And, certainly, enough is by all admitted—without taking into account other and more grave charges respecting which, when made against classes, there is not the same agreement—to explain why at that time discontent in relation to ecclesiastical affairs was very widely and extensively prevalent.\*

At such a crisis prudence dictated to the clergy to conciliate the laity; but instead of adopting this course they, as if blind to all that was passing around them, de-

---

\* See, as to the condition of the Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century in England and upon the Continent, Note A of Appendix.

manded exclusive rights and privileges, which, had there been no other reason, must of themselves have provoked hostility. Thus they insisted that they were to be tried only in the spiritual courts, and that for offences, nay, for the worst crimes, they were not answerable to the temporal. And this claim they made, while refusing to concede reciprocal advantages to the laity, over whom the bishops and their vicars-general persevered in asserting jurisdiction. Before these judges laymen were frequently prosecuted, and sentenced to censure or penances for mere breaches of the moral law—proceedings which were received (as an undue assumption of power) with a resentment that was heightened by the great expense attending them.

Under these circumstances it is not wonderful that the discontent of the laity developed into decided estrangement between them and the clerical order. The former were no longer willing to acquiesce in the relations which they had previously acknowledged towards the latter. A vague desire for change arose and began to spread through the community. Under its influence the minds of many became predisposed to hear with attention, and receive with favour, whatever appeared to promise reform of the grievances they complained of, or improvement in the system which tolerated them.

Such were the impulses agitating society in England

---

\* The estrangement of the laity from the clergy was especially remarked in the city of London. The Bishop of that See, in 1615, told Wolsey that “the citizens of London were so tainted with heresy, that if a clerk were tried before them they would find him as guilty as Cain, though he were as innocent as Abel.” (See Burnet, *Hist. Ref.*, vol. i. p. 35.)



when the movement initiated by Luther against the sale of Indulgences, authorized by Leo X., commenced in Germany. Attention was at once attracted to its proceedings ; and English discontent watched with intense interest its progress. The contagion of example rapidly began to spread.

Wolsey, at this period, was at the height of his power : he was the King's chief minister, his adviser, and his favourite. Perceiving clearly that no ordinary danger menaced the ecclesiastical system and ecclesiastical authority in England, foreseeing that, if discontent were not in some way appeased, England would follow in the footsteps of Germany, he sought to avert revolution by reform. Possessing legatine powers, which enabled him to visit the monasteries, he proceeded to examine such of these institutions as had poor endowments and few inmates, being those respecting which there was most complaint, and, obtaining from the Pope Bulls for the suppression of some of them, used their property towards founding new educational institutions. The object which he sought by these establishments seems to have been the improvement of the clergy—to remove from them the reproach of ignorance which the Lutheran party brought against them, and in accordance with advice, which he is said himself to have given the Pope, “ to set up learning against learning.”\* But before he could fully develop his ideas occurred his fall from power, and with his fall the failure of his designs.

---

\* Lord Herbert's *Henry VIII.*, p. 148. Hallam judges Wolsey severely ; Froude regards him more favourably ; Brewer, the able editor of the *State Papers*, thinks that had he served a different master he would have effected extensive reforms.



No one took his place or persevered with his measures. Even had his authority continued, they came—as is often the case with the policy of reform both in civil and ecclesiastical affairs—too late to have operated effectively. Matters had advanced beyond the stage when what Wolsey would have conceded might have availed, and the progress of opinion in the direction of extensive change could not be stayed. Germany had determined to reject mere internal amendment, and wholly to sever connexion with Rome. Less than Germany insisted upon would not have satisfied the requirements of the reforming party in England.

So long as Wolsey's influence continued, the King had taken the side of the Church of Rome in the controversies raised by Luther. When this influence ceased to affect him, he became her enemy. To this course he was impelled by the conduct of the Pope in reference to a suit instituted at the Papal Court to obtain a declaration that his marriage with Katherine of Arragon was invalid, upon the grounds that she had first been his brother's wife. Its progress was delayed both by the Pope and his legates who were appointed to try the case in England. Meeting from them only procrastination and indecision, and foreseeing ultimate failure, unless he could transfer his cause to some other tribunal, Henry resolved to repudiate the authority of the See of Rome.

This determination brought the whole influence of the Crown (always in England of preponderating weight) to aid the demand which was being made for reform in ecclesiastical affairs. It went beyond what was then sought. It placed the King, no less by the boldness

of his views than by his exalted rank, at the head of the reforming party, and thus led to their future course being directed by himself and his ministers.

The King's policy cannot be said to have been wholly new. It was no mere abrupt transition from unresisting admission of the supremacy of Rome to its total repudiation. It had been preceded by legislation of the English Parliament under former kings which restricted the power of the Pope, and prohibited in England the exercise of a jurisdiction permitted in other kingdoms. By this legislation any foreign interference with rights of patronage, with the processes of the King's courts, with the King's prerogative, was made illegal. The Church, it was declared, was founded and endowed by the ancestors of the King and of his nobles; and to the latter, therefore, it belonged to present to its dignities and benefices. The Crown of England was described as so free that it was in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God in all things touching its regalty, and to no other; it was not to be submitted to the Pope; and anyone purchasing or bringing from Rome Bulls, excommunications, instruments, or any other things touching the King, his regalty, or his realm, was subjected to the most severe penalties, including confiscation of goods and lands.\*

For the King's purpose it would have been sufficient to deny the Papal supremacy. If this were repudiated his suit could not be appealed to Rome. For the

---

\* 16 Ric. II. c. 5 (2), A. D. 1392; and see also 25 Edw. III. st. 5, c. 22; 25 Edw. III. st. 6; 38 Edw. III. st. 11; 13 Ric. II. st. 11, c. 2; 13 Ric. II. st. 11, c. 3; 7 Hen. IV. c. 8; 3 Hen. V. c. 8.

purpose also of getting rid of the existing religious system the same course was sufficient: since authority over all Christian Churches is the cardinal and essential principle of the Roman Catholic Church—that without which, says its (perhaps) most consummate advocate, it cannot continue to exist.\* Nevertheless, and although the Reformers in Germany had paused at this point, Henry, and those whom he now called to his councils, determined to proceed further, and to construct as well as to destroy, by substituting another supremacy in the Church of England for that which they removed—the supremacy of the Crown. As the King was head of the State, so also was he to be acknowledged “head of the Church”—*caput ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

There is no doubt that this proceeding was eminently calculated to facilitate the introduction of a new ecclesiastical constitution. Men’s minds had been long accustomed to submit to a controlling power, in reference not only to the affairs of the Church but to religion itself; and a mere negation of the existing system, without offering a substitute, would have furnished but a weak impulse to change. The substitution proposed was in analogy with the idea of the civil constitution of the country, in which the King occupied a pre-eminent and commanding position: and even as to the Church itself, it was an expansion, or, at the utmost, an excessive development, rather than a contradiction, of previous notions. In the laws of Edward the Confessor the King was termed

---

\* De quâ re agitur cum de primatu Pontificis agitur? brevissime dicam—de summâ rei Christianæ. Id enim quæritur, debeatne Ecclesia diutius consistere, an vero dissolvi et concidere.—Cardinal Bellarmine, *Præf. in libros de summo Pontif.*, vol. i. p. 189, G. (ed. 1615).



the Vicar of the Supreme King, and had been described as ruling and defending the Church.\*

When the title of "Head of the Church," was first claimed, no definition of its meaning or effect was given. But in subsequent proceedings, to procure from the clergy an admission of its propriety, the necessity of being more explicit was perceived. The objection, that it assumed for the King a spiritual character, was met by an express denial of the alleged meaning; and even Henry himself (although he probably was not unwilling to be Pope as well as King) explained, in a remarkable letter to the Bishop of Durham (Tunstall), that it was "as persons, and as to property, acts, and deeds, the clergy were under the King as head; and that as to spiritual things, as sacraments, they had no head but Christ."†

To establish the position which Henry and his ministers desired to assert for the Crown, it was thought necessary to obtain legislation from Parliament and previous acceptance by the clergy. For the latter purpose the Convocations of Canterbury and York offered an opportunity. They were assemblies representative of the clergy, which alone had power to impose upon them taxation to supply the needs of the State, and they might properly

---

\* The passage in the laws of Edward the Confessor, above referred to, is cited in the celebrated decision of the English Judges on the authority of the Crown in the English Church, known as Caudrey's Case, reported by Lord Coke (5 Rep.): it is also stated in Thorpe's *Laws of Edward the Confessor* (p. 193)—*Rex autem, qui vicarius Summi Regis est, ad hoc constitutus est, ut regnum et populum Domini, et super omnia, sanctam ecclesiam regat et defendat ab injuriis.*

† See summary of this letter in a very learned Paper of Bishop Stubbs, printed in the Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Ecclesiastical Courts, 1883.

be regarded as entitled to speak for the clerical order upon even more important subjects. Accordingly, it was determined to procure from these bodies an admission of the headship of the Church now claimed for the King.

At this time the clergy were in Henry's power. They had violated the law which forbade the Bulls of the Popes to be introduced into the country, or to be acted upon if they were introduced. The offence was primarily Wolsey's in obtaining the appointment of "Legate" from Rome. He had been arraigned for it; and when arraigned had made no defence. The clergy, as they had recognized the appointment and submitted to Wolsey's assumed jurisdiction under it, were involved in the legal consequences, and liable to the penalty of forfeiture of lands and goods, which we have seen was enacted by the statute that created the offence.\* On the King's part a compromise was accepted. In discharge of the liability which the clergy had incurred, the Convocations in 1531 agreed to pay for the King's use large sums of money. They also consented to acknowledge his supremacy, but with a qualification. They made the acknowledgment only so far as it was permitted by the law of Christ.†

In the year next after an acknowledgment of the title, "Head of the Church," had been made by the Convocations, the King obtained from Parliament the statute "for the Restraint of Appeals." This remarkable enact-

---

\* See page 10, *supra*.

† The words were :—Cujus (*i. e.* ecclesiæ) singularem protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et, quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput, ipsius majestatem recognoscimus (Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. iii. 742).



ment treated the King as "head of the realm, unto whom a body politic divided by the names of spirituality and temporality were bound to bear obedience." It then recited that he was furnished with plenary and whole power and jurisdiction, to render and yield justice and final determination to all residents or subjects within his realm, in all causes and contentions occurring within the limits thereof, without restraint or provocation to any foreign prince or potentate. And after these recitals it provided that all causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorce, rights of tithes, oblations and obventions (the knowledge of which causes, it declared, by the goodness of the princes of the realm and the laws and customs of the same appertained to the spiritual jurisdiction), should from thenceforth be heard and adjudged within the King's jurisdiction and authority, in such courts spiritual and temporal as the nature and qualities of the cases and matters in contention should require.\*

To this Act, "in Restraint of Appeals," was added in 1533 another known as the "Act of Submission," prohibiting the Convocations from legislating or acting without the King's leave. It recited the submission made by these bodies in 1531, and now, among other matters, enacted that the clergy should not in time coming promulgate or execute any canons, constitutions, or ordinances, in their Convocations (which it was declared should always be summoned by authority of the King's writ), without the King's assent and licence. And preliminary to thus enacting, it was declared that the clergy had acknowledged, according (it added) to

---

\* 24 Henry VIII. ch. 12 (Eng.), A. D. 1532.

the truth, that the Convocation of the clergy is, always hath been, and ought to be, assembled only by the King's writ, and that, when submitting themselves to the King, they had promised, *in verbo sacerdotii*, that they would not presume to enact or execute any new canons, constitutions, or ordinances, without the King's licence.\*

The "Act in Restraint of Appeals," and the "Act of Submission," were followed by the Act known as the "Supremacy Act." It was entitled, "The King's Grace," to be authorized "Supreme Head." It commenced by a recital in the following terms:—"Albeit the King's majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the clergy in their Convocations, yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and to repress and extirpate errors, heresies, enormities, and abuses heretofore used in the same." And having thus announced the existing law, and declared the motives for its announcement, it then proceeded to enact, "that the King our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana ecclesia*; and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial Crown of this realm, as well the style and title thereof as all pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, and immunities, to the said dignity belonging."†

The date of the passing of this Act of Parliament was

---

\* 25 Henry VIII. ch. 19 (Eng.), A. D. 1533.

† 26 Henry VIII. ch. 1 (Eng.), A. D. 1534.

the 15th of November, 1534.\* It completed the statutable definition of the position of the Crown in the Church of England. Down to that time no alteration had been made in the received system of theology : indeed, no discussion of doctrinal questions had begun either in the Convocations or Parliament of England. If the King had formed opinions differing from the tenets taught by the Church of Rome, in which he had been educated and of which he had at one time been a strenuous defender, he did not disclose that he had done so. Whatever progress the religious views of the Continental Reformers may before this time have attained in England was exclusively due to the first converts to them, and to independent investigation on the part of the people.

---

\* This is the date adopted by Bishop Stubbs in his very learned Paper printed in the Appendix to the Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the Ecclesiastical Courts (A. D. 1883).

## CHAPTER II.

[1535-1547.]

IN the historical records of the sixteenth century, so far as they have been preserved, nothing appears to indicate that the religious movement, which preceded the ecclesiastical legislation then enacted in England, extended itself to Ireland, or that any of a similar character originated at that period with its people. Nevertheless, from the time when the policy of separating the national Church from the See of Rome was entered upon in England by Henry VIII. and his ministers, there could have been little doubt that they would seek also to introduce it in Ireland. According to the ideas then accepted, the latter country was dependent upon, and subordinate to, the former; bound to receive thence the principles of its laws. This was more especially the case in respect of questions relating to the prerogative; the King of England, although in Ireland having only the title of "Lord" (*dominus Hiberniæ*), being supposed to possess in the two kingdoms the same jurisdiction and pre-eminence.

The influence of these general principles, as motives impelling the King actively to interfere in Ireland for the furtherance of his own views, was increased by the



exigency of his position in reference to the divorce he had obtained from Queen Katherine and the marriage he had contracted with Anne Boleyn. The validity of these proceedings turned upon the decision that might be come to as to the supremacy. The Pope had not sanctioned them, and if he were supreme each Church under his rule must follow his judgment upon them. However legal persons in Ireland might determine, the whole ecclesiastical body would be arrayed against them—a condition of affairs which, with the uncertain and insecure allegiance as yet obtained by the English Crown from the native Irish, could not be contemplated without alarm.

It happened that, while Henry was engaged in attaining his objects in England, the rebellion of Lord Thomas Fitz Gerald commenced in Ireland. At the beginning of the year 1535,\* its speedy suppression and the restoration of the English government to its former authority in Ireland were anticipated, and the time seemed favourable for proceeding to obtain from the Church in Ireland conformity with the Church in England in reference to the matters lately the subject of legislation by the English Parliament. Accordingly, early in this year Henry determined to assert in Ireland the same rights and authority in connexion with the Church as he had succeeded in having acknowledged in England. In order to this it became indispensable (none of the Irish bishops or clergy manifesting any tendency in favour of the Reformation) to send over some ecclesiastic of eminence who would in that kingdom, as Cranmer had done in

---

\* In the dates the year is assumed to begin on the 1st of January, and not, according to the practice of the time, on the 25th of March.



England, by his advocacy support the measures which it might be thought expedient to adopt. The person selected, owing, it is said, to the advice of Cromwell, who had succeeded to much of Wolsey's influence with the King, was George Browne, a monk of the Augustinian Order, and its Provincial in England. He had become noted in London for preaching, which in many respects was adverse to the doctrines taught at Rome, and was supposed to sympathise with the opinions of the German Reformers. A vacancy in the See of Dublin, which had for some time been unfilled, gave the opportunity to confer upon him a position of eminence in the Irish Church; and the concurrence of the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and of the Prior and Chapter of the Church of the Holy Trinity (afterwards known as the Cathedral of Christ Church), Dublin, having been obtained in his appointment to fill the vacant office, he was, at London, on the 19th of March, 1535, pursuant to a mandate from the King, consecrated Archbishop of Dublin, by Archbishop Cranmer, assisted by two suffragan bishops.

Browne's appointment was followed by the issue of a Commission directed to him and to other persons of eminence, by which they were directed to confer with "the nobility and gentry" in Ireland, and endeavour to procure their support for the King's ecclesiastical policy, and in particular to induce them to admit his supremacy. In conjunction with his colleagues, the Archbishop during some months persevered in exertions for this purpose, not unaccompanied by danger to himself personally, but without attaining any success. From the clergy generally he met opposition. In this they

were led by Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, a prelate highly esteemed and possessing much influence. Those who resisted Browne's suggestions argued that whatever might be elsewhere alleged against the authority of the Roman See, it was not in Ireland that it should be denied by a King of England, for to this source he owed his own title to rule the island. "The Pope's predecessors," said Cromer, "gave it to the King's ancestors."\*

In the autumn of 1535 (the Commissioners having come to recognize that it was useless for them to proceed further), Browne addressed a letter to Cromwell, in which, after explaining the failure of their proceedings and the causes of it, especially adducing as such the ignorance of the clergy, the predilection of the people for the religion to which they were accustomed, and the small value set on the King's Commission, he recommended that a Parliament should be called to enact the Supremacy.†

At this time, notwithstanding that nearly four centuries of English rule had elapsed, the Irish people were separated into two great divisions, forming, in effect, distinct nations, differing in language, sentiments, and interests. One was composed of descendants of the English, who had from time to time settled in the country, principally in Dublin and a district around it, termed the Pale, composed of portions of the four counties, Dublin, Kildare, Meath, and Louth. The other con-

---

\* The principal authority for the transactions of this period is a *Life of Browne*, compiled by Sir James Ware's son, and published by him along with the English version of the *Annals* of his father. See Note B of Appendix.

† This letter will be found in Note C of Appendix.

sisted of the native population, who occupied the provinces of Ulster and Connaught, almost all of Munster, and the greater part of Leinster. Parliament represented only the English race, and legislated with a view solely to their interests. It was composed of two Houses—a House of Lords and a House of Commons. The former consisted of laymen, who had received or inherited peerages conferred by the English Crown, of the Bishops, and of the Superiors of twenty-four Religious Houses. As yet no Irish had been made lay Peers. The House of Commons was returned from counties, then not more than twelve in number,\* and from cities and boroughs situate in those counties. The number of members did not, it is said, reach one hundred. None came from any place exclusively inhabited by the Irish; and a native, if elected, was not allowed to sit.†

In England, with every Parliament the Convocations of Canterbury and York, consisting of the bishops, of some of the cathedral dignitaries, and of representatives of the clergy, called Proctors, who were returned from the different dioceses, were summoned, and voted the supplies contributed by the clergy to the State. In Ireland no assembly of the character of the English Convocations had been, down to this time, summoned with Parliament,‡

---

\* These counties were Waterford, Dublin, Kildare, Meath, Uriel or Louth, Catherlough or Carlow, Kilkenny, Wexford, Cork, Limerick, Kerry, Tipperary. Of the last there were two divisions, each returning members, as if they were separate counties. The formation of these twelve counties is attributed to King John.

† The constitution of the Irish Parliament is further considered in Note D of the Appendix.

‡ As will subsequently appear, an Irish Convocation was convened by the Crown, first in the reign of James the First, and last in the reign



or had assumed, like them, the right to vote a subsidy. Usually, however, with the bishops attending an Irish Parliament there came Proctors representing the clergy of their dioceses, who were entitled to sit in the House of Commons along with the lay members, but whether as a constituent part thereof, and with the right to vote, or as assessors and advisers, and if so, whether with a veto, does not seem to have been down to that time settled.

After Browne's advice had been given to convene Parliament, there appears to have been some delay, for its first subsequent meeting was not until the month of May in the next year (A. D. 1536). It was then found that the Proctors claimed to vote, and that if their claim was admitted they were likely to obstruct the King's measures. An Act was therefore passed which, professing to be in accordance with the opinions of the judges and other learned men, declared that the Proctors were only counsellors and assistants, and not members of the House of Commons.

When the Proctors were thus excluded from voting the House of Commons was, for legislative purposes, wholly lay; also it was entirely English. Accordingly, its members appear not to have made any objection or difficulty as regards the question of the Supremacy.\* It

---

of Queen Anne. A summary history of Irish Convocations will be found in a Paper on the subject read by Dr. Reeves, now Bishop of Down in the disestablished Church of Ireland, at a meeting of the Church Congress in Dublin, A. D. 1868. It is much to be desired that Dr. Reeves's contributions to Irish ecclesiastical history, made on this and similar occasions, should be published in a collected form.

\* Justice Brabazon wrote to Cromwell that "the Commons' House is marvellous good for the King's causes, and all the learned men within the same be very good." 17th May, 1536.—*State Papers*, ii. p. 316.

was otherwise in the House of Peers, where the Spiritual Lords were numerous.\* A summary of the arguments used by Archbishop Browne in that assembly, when answering his brethren, has been preserved. They rest, first upon the King's authority in the State—"He that will not (he says) pass this Act, as I do, is no true subject to his Highness"; and next upon precedents of similar concessions by Rome itself—"Rome and her bishops in the Fathers' days acknowledged emperors, kings, and princes, to be supreme over their dominions, nay, Christ's own vicars."†

Ultimately an Irish Supremacy Act,‡ modelled upon the English, and of exactly the same effect, was obtained from this Parliament. It declared that the King our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of the realm of England, and Lords of this land of Ireland, shall be accepted, taken, and reputed the only supreme

\* The number does not appear, but Lord Gray and Justice Brabazon say of the Spiritual Lords "they sought an occasion to deny all things that should be presented to the Upper House, where they were the most in number."—*State Papers*, Hen. VIII., ii. p. 438.

† Such report of Browne's speech as has been preserved is given in note E of the Appendix.

‡ 28 Hen. VIII. ch. 5 (Ireland), A. D. 1537. The Acts of this Parliament are not numbered in the order in which they were passed. The Supremacy Act is ch. 5; the Act as to the proctors, which preceded it, is ch. 12. The Parliament commenced to sit in May, 1536, at Dublin; was adjourned to Kilkenny, 25th July following; was there again adjourned, and afterwards met at various places successively; until finally, on 13th October, 1537, meeting at Dublin, it was terminated and concluded 20th December, 1537. The date assigned for the Acts in the editions of the Statutes is 1537, being the year which corresponded with the end of the Parliament when the roll of its transactions was completed.—See statement prefixed to the Acts of 28 Hen. VIII., in the edition of the Statutes, 1765.



head in earth of the whole Church of Ireland, called *Hibernica ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the Crown of England, as well the style and title thereof as all jurisdictions, &c., to this same dignity belonging.

The enacting part was prefaced by a preamble which recited . . . "Like as the King's Majesty fully and rightfully is and ought to be supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the clergie, and authorized by an Act of Parliament made and established in the said realm; so in like manner of wise, forasmuch as this land of Ireland is depending and belonging justly and rightfully to the Imperial Crown of England."\* By these words it was in effect declared that Ireland was in such a relation to the Crown of England, that whatever was the position of the latter in the Church of England, the same must be its position in the Church of Ireland. The King was head of both Churches. And that he was such in Ireland was not alleged to be because of any vote of an Irish Synod or of the will of the Irish people; it was a prerogative right, which, having been established in England, must as a corollary and necessary consequence exist also in Ireland.

The Irish Supremacy Act was, like the English, accompanied by a statute prohibiting appeals being taken to Rome, and substituting a tribunal of delegates, to be appointed under the Great Seal of Ireland, to hear them. This statute recited that the land of Ireland was united, knit, and belonging to the Crown of England,

---

\* The Supremacy Act is given in full in Note F of Appendix.

which Crown (it declared) was endowed with power and pre-eminence sufficient to yield full and plenary remedies in all causes.\* A third Act also of this time declared that the King's majesty, the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons, were forced of necessity, for the public weal, to exclude any foreign pretended power or jurisdiction within the land; and enacted that any person, by writing, act, or deed, obstinately and maliciously maintaining the authority of the Bishop of Rome or of his See should incur the penalties of the English statute of *premunire* (16 Ric. II.); and that an oath acknowledging the King's supremacy should be taken according to the form, and upon the occasions, therein prescribed; an obstinate refusal by anyone bound to take it being declared to amount to treason.†

That this legislation had, or was expected to have, any practical effect outside the districts inhabited by the English colonists is not probable. In the Irish country, that is, in very much the greater part of the island, English law was not acknowledged; the King's writ did not, as it was expressed, run; the natives adhered to their own ancient customs and usages. They were nominally subjects of the Crown of England, but were in fact governed either by Chieftains of their own race, or by Anglo-Norman Lords, to whose ancestors estates, which by conquest or as forfeitures from rebellious owners the Crown acquired, had from time to time been granted, and who in manners and sentiments were as Irish as the Irish themselves. Too powerful to be controlled by

---

\* 28 Henry VIII. ch. 6 (Ir.) A. D. 1537.

† 28 Henry VIII. ch. 13 (Ir.) A. D. 1537.

a weak central executive government, these chieftains and nobles, the real rulers of the country, assumed the position of independent princes, making peace and war between themselves, as their interests or enmities prompted, without reference to the governors whom the English kings placed over the country.\*

Even in the Pale at this period the English interest was weak. It had declined during the civil wars of the houses of York and Lancaster, when the resources of the mother country were engaged at home, and assistance could not be spared elsewhere. The depression thus caused still continued. While this was the state of affairs, the Irish of the tribes which surrounded the Pale had crossed with impunity its boundaries, and gained possession of much land within them. The colonists of that part of the island, inadequately protected, and subject to spoliation and violence, became dispirited, and either left the country or took refuge in the immediate neighbourhood of Dublin. Beyond a very limited distance from the seat of Government,† the English language, habits, and manners, ceased to be in use.

With such difficulties surrounding the introduction of a new policy, it became of importance to remove whatever tended to diminish the royal authority, or hinder

---

\* In a remarkable State Paper written in, or not long before, 1515, the names of 60 Irish chieftains possessing "regions, some as big as half a shire, some a little less," described as "chief captains who live by the sword," and of 30 Anglo-Irish chiefs or lords, described as "captains of the English noble folk, who follow the same Irish order," are given. See Note G of Appendix.

† In 1535 an important representation of the state of the Pale was made by official persons through Allen, Master of the Rolls, to the King. See Note H of Appendix.



the admission of its pre-eminence by all the King's subjects. These consequences were attributed to the title of "Lord," borne by the kings of England in Ireland. It was considered to denote inferiority, and its origin was referred to the circumstance of a grant of the island from Pope Adrian IV. to Henry II.\* If that monarch and his successors had other right, if their title was original, and not derived from another power, why (it was argued) were they not kings? To take away the grounds on which this reasoning rested, and confer upon the Crown such additional influence as it was thought would accompany the appellation of higher dignity, Parliament was summoned; and that its decisions might possess more than ordinary weight and importance, Irish chieftains were induced to attend it. An Act was passed which—after reciting that under the name of lords the kings of England had all the jurisdiction of a king, but that for lack of the name of kings, Irishmen and inhabitants within the realm of Ireland had not been so obedient to his highness and his progenitors as they, according to their allegiance, ought to have been—provided that the King, his heirs and successors, Kings of England, should be always Kings of Ireland.†

---

\* See Note C of Appendix. The prevalence of this supposition among the Irish was asserted by Allen, Master of the Rolls, when he recommended a change in the King's title: "Irishmen, of long continuance have supposed the regal estate of this land to consist in the bishop of Rome, and the lordship of the kings of England here to be but a governance under the obedience of the same, which causeth them to have more respect of due subjection unto the said bishop than to our sovereign lord."—*State Papers*, ii. p. 480. Bishop Staples, in 1538, advised to the same effect: *State Papers*, iii. p. 30.

† 33 Hen. VIII. ch. 1 (Ir.), A.D. 1542.

The Act was followed by exertions to conciliate the most important of the Irish and Anglo-Irish chieftains, who had hitherto stood apart from the King's government in Ireland. Peerages were conferred upon several of the former; and Desmond, the most powerful of the latter, was placed upon the Council. Partly owing to this policy, and partly to success in some encounters with the natives of a previous date, the influence of the Crown steadily gained ground during the remainder of Henry's reign; the disaffected submitted; and at the time of his death, about six years later, there appeared a general acquiescence in his authority.

These circumstances, if taken advantage of, might have in some degree facilitated missionary exertion in favour of Protestant tenets among the Irish. In England the Bible was translated and placed in the churches for the congregations to read; and the theology of the Reformers was taught by preaching and by writings extensively circulated. In Ireland neither of these means of instructing the people were at this time adopted; the Bible was not translated into the Irish tongue, nor were Irish-speaking teachers of the new religious system sent among the natives. Acknowledgments of the supremacy were, in important instances, obtained from persons of eminence, both lay and clerical, in the Irish districts,\* but such acknowledgments were consistent with their

---

\* As many as two archbishops and eight bishops took the oath of supremacy at Clonmel before Archbishop Browne, the Lord Chancellor, and other dignitaries, when the latter were upon a progress through the country (*State Papers*, Hen. VIII., vol. iii. p. 117). The agreements of submission between Henry and the Irish chieftains contain admissions that the King was head of the Church of Ireland (Leland, vol. ii. p. 168, 180; and compare Richey, p. 333).



not conforming on other points, and were not followed by any efforts on their part to gain over converts even upon the question of the supremacy.

It must therefore be pronounced that the Reformation was at this time presented only to the English portion of the people. To them it came not merely from the Government, but from the teaching of those members of the clerical order who followed Archbishop Browne, and gave their support to the opinions approved in England. No difficulty caused by difference of language, or want of respect for the source whence these opinions came, distracted the attention of the colonists from the topics submitted for their consideration. They had never ceased to sympathise with the mother country, to reverence its authority, and follow its lead in politics and manners.

Much the greater proportion of those who were of English descent dwelt in Dublin and the part of the Pale which surrounded it. The Pale was situate in four dioceses, Dublin, Meath, Kildare, and Armagh. The bishop of the first-named diocese was Archbishop Browne; of the second, Staples, who adopted the opinions of the Reformers as decidedly, and advocated them as strenuously, as Browne. In 1540, a vacancy enabled the King to nominate to Kildare an Irish ecclesiastic, Miagh, who immediately acted with Browne and Staples. The part of the Pale within Armagh diocese was small. Thus episcopal influence among the English was substantially on the side of the new ecclesiastical policy.

It requires to be kept in mind, when examining the events of this reign, that neither in England nor Ireland

had doctrinal teaching assumed the form which it took under Edward VI. and Elizabeth. In Ireland no Act of Parliament or proclamation of the Government gave an authoritative exposition upon the subject. In England a statute was passed, and publications were sanctioned by the King, which expressly dealt with questions of theology, and which show that much of the old tenets were to be still retained. Thus "the Act of the Six Articles" (A.D. 1539) affirmed transubstantiation, the celibacy of the clergy, private masses (*i.e.* for the dead), and auricular confession; and the book called "the Erudition of a Christian Man" adhered to the Roman Catholic view of the Sacraments as to number and nature. The subjects respecting which in both countries distinctly Protestant opinions were pronounced were "the remission of sins," and the graven images and relics in the churches. The former, it was declared, could not be given by the Pope, or any other ecclesiastical authority; the images and relics were ordered to be completely removed.

A document of importance, indicating, so far as it extended, the ideas approved in Ireland at this time by the reformed party, has been preserved,\* and may properly be now referred to in connexion with the subject of doctrinal teaching. It consists of directions issued by Archbishop Browne to his clergy to be read in the parish churches, as a guide for the prayers of the congregations. It is entitled "the Form of the Beads."† It commences

---

\* *State Papers*, vol. ii. p. 564, Hen. VIII. pt. iii., A. D. 1538.

† The "Form of Beads" is printed in full in the *State Papers*. The word "beads" was at first used to signify prayers, afterwards what they were counted by.

by directing them “to pray for the universal Catholic Church, both quick and dead, and especially for the Church of England and Ireland, and first for the King, supreme head on earth immediate under God of the said Church.” It then declares that the jurisdiction usurped by the Bishop of Rome is now, by the authority of Parliament, and by the consent and agreement of the bishops, prelates, and universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of the clergy both of England and Ireland, extinct, and ceased for ever; and directs this to be published to their children and servants. This, the clergyman, when reading the prescribed words, is to say he himself knows to be true, and that it is certified to him by his Ordinary, the Archbishop of Dublin, under his seal. The “form” then exhorts the congregation to have no confidence in the Pope, or his letters of pardon (since “no man can forgive sins but God only”), and to put all their confidence and trust in our Saviour, Jesus Christ, “which is gentle and loving, and requireth nothing of us, when we have offended him, but that we should repent and forsake our sins, and believe steadfastly that he is Christ the Son of the living God, and that He died for our sins, and so forth, as it is contained in the *Credo*; and that through Him, and by Him, and by none other, we shall have remission of our sins, *a pœnâ et culpâ*.” Prayers for the royal family and persons in authority, as specified, are then enjoined; so they are also “for the souls departed out of this world in the faith of our Saviour Christ, which sleep in rest and peace, that they may rise again and reign with him in eternal life.” Lastly, it directs that “for these and for grace every man say a Pater-noster and an Ave.”



Beside the legislation which has been narrated, measures affecting the property of the Church also came into operation during this reign. Thus, the First Fruits and Twentieths were added to the revenues of the Crown. The former was a tax of one year's emoluments of a bishopric or benefice levied from the incumbent on his appointment, and theretofore paid to the Pope; the latter was a proportion of his annual income, which was now made payable to the King. The Religious Houses, except such as were situate in the remote Irish districts of the north, were dissolved, and their property confiscated. The entire of their possessions were either retained for the benefit of the Crown or granted to laymen: nothing was restored to the Church.

There was not in this reign any legislation relating to convocations or national synods: none respecting the former, because they had never been convened in Ireland; none respecting the latter, because they had long fallen into disuse, very probably in consequence of the clergy being, like the laity, divided asunder according to the races from which they were respectively descended, and therefore declining to meet together. Legislation was, of course, not needed in respect of provincial or diocesan synods, which were summoned by archbishops and bishops, and which met from time to time; but, it is said, were attended only by the English, and held, as it was expressed, *inter Anglicos*.\*

At the period of the Supremacy Act neither any of the prelates who were then in office, nor any of the

---

\* Leland, vol. ii. p. 159.



incumbents of the parochial benefices were disturbed. No schism, therefore, was caused in the Church. Between that date and Henry's death some vacancies occurred in the bishoprics. One of these was in the See of Armagh: to this and to others the King appointed directly; in some instances he confirmed appointments made by the Pope.\* The succession in the benefices was also kept up, such vacancies as happened being filled.

---

\* See as to these appointments and confirmations Note I of Appendix.

---

## CHAPTER III.

[1547-1553.]

UPON the death of Henry VIII. (January 28th, 1547) his son Edward VI.—then a child nine years old—succeeded to the throne both in England and Ireland. The mother of the young king was Jane Seymour, whom Henry had married upon Anne Boleyn's death. She and other members of her family had favoured the Reformation; and her brother, the Earl of Hertford, afterwards Duke of Somerset, who had been appointed one of the guardians of Edward, and from among them was chosen to act as Protector during his minority, now manifested a decided adherence to Protestantism.

The official position of Hertford enabled him to control the education of his ward. The persons placed around him, his teachers and associates, were selected because hostile to the Church of Rome. What Edward at first learned from the instruction of others subsequent reflection (for he was precocious and inclined to religious inquiries) confirmed. He gave his confidence to the Reformers; as he advanced in years became more and more attached to them, and strenuously supported every measure calculated to promote their views.

Accordingly, during Edward's reign, the influence of the Crown and the policy of its Ministers were con-

stantly directed to confirm the separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome. Under his father this had been effected, not merely by repudiation of the Papal Supremacy, but also by authoritative expositions of dissent from some doctrinal tenets of the latter Church. No change, however, had been made in the services used at divine worship, further than by publishing a Litany in the English tongue. The "Mass" was still celebrated in Latin, and according to the ancient form. Collects, too, in which intercession by Saints was prayed for, were still read; and ceremonial observances remained substantially as they had been.

This was the condition of affairs at Henry's death. But immediately after that event measures were adopted which were designed to introduce considerable changes. A Committee of Bishops and Divines of the English Church, of whom Cranmer was one, were directed to examine the existing liturgies, and afterwards to revise and translate them into the English language. In the discharge of this duty they were directed to "have as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scriptures as to the usages in the primitive Church.\*

In the Services then most approved in England there was not uniformity. They varied in different dioceses: thus there was the use of Sarum, of Hereford, of Bangor, of York, and of Lincoln. In the province of Canterbury the use of Sarum generally prevailed.† In

---

\* This is so stated in the recitals of the statute which afterwards enacted the use of the Prayer-book as it was framed by the Committee.

† It appears from Lyndwood, a canonist of authority, that in the province of Canterbury the use of Sarum was followed. The following

Ireland it is not certain what liturgies were followed. At the Synod of Cashel (1172), held by order of Henry II., it was directed that all Divine matters should for the future, in all parts of Ireland, be regulated after the model of Holy Church, according to the observance of the Anglican Church.\* But it may be doubted whether this was ever completely carried into practice, for the English and Irish portions of the clergy lived for the most part separate from each other. In Dublin, however, and its neighbourhood the example of the English Church would have decisive influence: and as the intercourse from Dublin with England was with the dioceses where the use of Sarum was adopted, it may be assumed that the services there were according to that model.†

The result of the deliberations of the Committee was that a Prayer-book in the English language for the Church of England was by them completed. The draft, as they produced it, was submitted to the Convocations of Canterbury and York.‡ From them it was transferred to Parliament, by which a statute was passed (A.D. 1549) enacting that the Book should be read at

reason was assigned for it: Episcopus namque Sarum in collegio episcoporum est precentor, et temporibus quibus archiepiscopus Cantuariensis solenniter celebrat divina, præsentē collegio episcoporum, chorum in divinis officiis regere debet, de observantiâ et consuetudine antiquâ (Prov. de fer. ii. 4). The composition of the Sarum use is attributed to Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, 1078.

\* Omnia divina ad instar sacrosanctæ ecclesiæ, juxta quod Anglicana observat ecclesia, in omnibus partibus Hiberniæ amodo tractentur. Cited by Ussher (iv. 275) from Giraldus Cambrensis.

† See note K of Appendix.

‡ Proctor *On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 22.



common and open prayer in every cathedral or parish church, or other place within the realm of England, Wales, Calais, or other the King's dominions.

When the observance of the new Prayer-book had been thus enjoined in England, the King's Ministers determined upon introducing it in the Irish Church also; and they proceeded to do this without convening an Irish Parliament. It will be observed that the English Act in relation to the Prayer-book directed its adoption not only in the places specified in it, but also in other the King's dominions. Whether at the time language of this character was supposed to make the Act operative in Ireland does not appear. Similar words had been used in English Acts of Henry VIII.—viz. the Act of Appeals, the Act of First Fruits, and the Act of Faculties—but the English Government had not rested content with these enactments to carry out its policy, and make the ecclesiastical laws of the Churches of England and Ireland the same; and it had, accordingly, procured from the Irish Parliament a re-enactment of the two first Acts, and an express extension to Ireland of the third.\* It is, therefore, not improbable that in dispensing with the assistance of an Irish Parliament the King's Ministers relied upon the authority of the Crown, now that its supremacy had been acknowledged by the Irish Parliament,† as entitling the King to direct forms of worship.

But whatever may have been the views entertained as to the foundation of the King's power, the proceeding adopted to enforce the use of the new

---

\* See Note L of Appendix.

† See page 23, *supra*.

English Prayer-book in the Irish Church was simply a mandate from the King. On the 6th of February, 1551, a letter in his name, and purporting to come from him, was addressed to Sir Anthony St. Leger, who was then the Deputy,\* in which, after reciting that the King's father had translations of the Bible placed in the parish churches in England, and that he himself had caused the liturgy and prayers to be also "translated† for the general benefit of his subjects' understandings, wherever assembled in the parish churches, either to pray or to hear prayers read, and in order that they might the better join therein in unity, hearts and voice," he directed notice to be given to the bishops and clergy "to perfect, execute, and obey his royal will and pleasure accordingly."

Soon after St. Leger had received this communication he summoned an assembly of bishops and clergy, in order to submit it for their consideration, in the hope that he might induce them willingly to act in conformity with its directions.‡ This is the first recorded occasion, after the Supremacy Act, on which reference was in

---

\* Justiciary, Deputy, Lord Lieutenant, were the names given to the Chief Governors of Ireland who were from time to time appointed by the Kings of England.

† It has been suggested that the word "translated" was used in consequence of the amount of the old Sarum services which (as will subsequently be seen) was actually translated and retained; but it is more probable that it merely means "have been expressed in English:" translation referring to the language, not the contents. The full words are, "translated into our mother tongue of the realm of England according to the assembly of divines lately met within the same."

‡ Both Sir Richard Cox and the *Life of Browne* by Ware state that the persons summoned were the archbishops and bishops, together with other of the then clergy.

Ireland made by or on behalf of the Crown to any ecclesiastical body in relation to measures affecting the Church ; Henry VIII. and the Deputies during his reign having had recourse only to Parliament.

On the first of March, 1551, the assembly summoned by the Lord Deputy met. The See of Armagh, to which at this time was attached the Primacy in the Church of Ireland, was filled by Dowdall, who had been appointed by Henry VIII. upon the death of Cromer. He had previously been Prior of a monastery, which he surrendered, and had also been Cromer's official. Pope Paul III., not recognizing the King's right to nominate, conferred the office upon another ecclesiastic, Waucop, who, relying upon this title, attended the Council of Trent, and subscribed himself Armachanus. Dowdall, however, being consecrated in Ireland by Staples, Bishop of Meath, and other bishops, gained and kept possession of the See, and was acknowledged by the suffragan bishops and by the clergy of the province to be the Archbishop. When the King's directions had been brought before the assembly by St. Leger, Dowdall, who attended as Primate, and, notwithstanding the events connected with his appointment, adhered to Rome, at once opposed the adoption of the Prayer-book, particularly objecting that the most ignorant could then say Mass. A discussion ensued between him and the Deputy ; and ultimately the Archbishop, with all his suffragan bishops, except Staples, Bishop of Meath, retired from the meeting. Upon this occurring, the Deputy, it is reported, turned to Browne, who in the absence of the Archbishop of Armagh was, as Archbishop of Dublin, the highest in rank, and handed him the King's order. Browne then



addressed those who remained, and urged upon them the duty of obedience to the King, very much in the same manner as he had formerly expressed himself in the House of Lords during the debate upon the supremacy in the late king's time. With those who continued present he appears to have been successful, and to have obtained from them acquiescence in his propositions.\*

After this meeting a proclamation was issued to carry the King's directions into effect, and a Service in English was publicly performed in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, on Easter Day, 1551, in the presence of the Deputy, Archbishop Browne, and the Mayor and Bailiffs of the city. Subsequently Services in the English language came into use in many churches of the Pale.

The Prayer-book which was thus introduced into the Churches of England and Ireland has been since subject to several revisions, which will hereafter be noticed and come under consideration. With the alterations made at these revisions it is still in use in the two Churches. It was itself founded upon the then existing Services, especially those prescribed by the use of Sarum. A Preface, still printed in the English Prayer-book, explained that originally it had been so ordered, that "all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once in the yeare"; that this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers had been altered, broken,

---

\* Ware's *Life of Browne* says that "after this" (but whether after Browne's speech or after the meeting is not clear) "several of the meeker or most moderate of the bishops and clergy cohered with Browne." The meeting being of the utmost importance, I have thought it best to extract in the Appendix the full account of it given in the *Life of Browne*, the only authority upon the subject. See Note M.



and neglected ; but that now there would be “ an order for praier (as touching the reading of holy scripture) muche agreeable to the mynde and purpose of the old fathers, and a great deale more profitable and commodious, than that which of late was used.” It also pointed out the advantage of having one use in the whole realm, instead of the varying uses at that time adopted in the different dioceses.

As before the death of King Edward there was a revision of the Services which were now sanctioned, the Prayer-book, such as it was originally issued, is known as “ the First Prayer-book of Edward the Sixth.” It did not contain any forms for ordaining and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, or for adult baptism : neither had it prayers to be used at sea. With these exceptions it had the Services now contained in the authorized Prayer-book of the Church of England ; but (in consequence of the subsequent revisions which have been alluded to) not without numerous variations from them. Minutely to notice the differences thus caused would detain too long ; but some, which seem to call for more particular attention, will be now stated. . . . The Morning Prayer then entitled “ an order for Mattyns dayly through the yere ”—which at present begins with Prefatory Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Absolution, all preceding the Lord’s Prayer—began at once with the Lord’s Prayer, which is described as “ called the Pater Noster.” The same was the case with Evening Prayer, termed “ an ordre for Even Song throughout the yeare.” The Communion Service—which is described as “ the Supper of the Lorde, and the Holy Communion commonly called the Masse ”—varied from

the present Service in several particulars. The Ten Commandments were not, as now, then read. After the reading of the Offertory sentences there was a direction (now omitted) that "so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on one side and the women on the other": in the prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church there were clauses, since expunged, which offered a thanksgiving for "the grace and vertue declared in all thy saintes, from the beginning of the worlde, and chiefly in the glorious and moste blessed Virgin Mary," and which commended "unto thy mercye (O Lorde) all other thy servauntes which are departed hence from us, with the signe of faith, and nowe do rest in the slepe of peace." In administering the Communion, "a litle pure and cleane water" was to be put in the wine; and in the prayer used for consecrating the elements were to be said the following words . . . "with thy holy spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." The sign of the cross was to be made when repeating the words "bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures," &c. While delivering the elements only the first of the two clauses now said by the officiating minister was to be used. In the rubrics the Communion-table was "the Lorde's table," "the altar," and in two instances "God's boord." In the Litany (which then in order came after the Communion Service, and was described as "the Letany and Suffrages") there was a suffrage, since expunged, praying for deliverance from the tyrannie of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable

enormities," and the clergy were described as bishops, pastours, and ministers of the Church, and not, as now, as bishops, priests, and deacons. Of the matters then in the other Services, and not now retained, the following are important. . . . In the Baptismal Service there was a form of abjuration desiring the unclean spirit to come out of the child ; and there were two ancient ceremonies, viz. investing the child with a white garment called the chrisom, and anointing it. At the end of the Marriage Service there was a rubric directing that "the newe married persons (the same day of their marriage) must receive the holy communion." In the Visitation of the Sick it was directed that "if the sick person desyre to be anoynted, the priest should anoynt him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the crosse," and offering a prayer that . . . "as with this visible oyle the body outwardly is anoynted, so our heavenly father graunt of his infinite goodness that thy soul inwardly may be anoynted with the holy gost, who is the spirite of all strengthe, coumforte, reliefe, and gladnesse." In the Burial Service provision was made for "the celebration of the Holy Communion," and there was a prayer that "the sins which the deceased committed in this world be not imputed to him."\*

If the Services of Edward's first Prayer-book be compared with the old Services, they will be found to be largely repetitions of the latter. All the collects at Morning and Evening Prayer, and fifty-four of the collects read with the epistles and gospels, are transla-

---

\* The edition of King Edward's first Prayer-book which I have followed is one printed in London in 1549, and which has lately been reprinted in London."



tions.\* The same is the case with much of the other Services. Hence, no doubt, it is that the excellence of the English Prayer-book has arisen. The prayers adopted from the ancient liturgies have at all times been held to present the most admirable models for public worship. A severe simplicity of thought and expression characterizes the originals, and the translations were made at a period when the English language exhibited a strength and majesty never since surpassed. It is, however, remarkable that the portions of the present Services which were added to, or substituted for, omissions from the old, have attained an elevation of sentiment and diction not unworthy to be placed beside what was retained, so that nowhere is there perceptible inequality or want of harmony—a circumstance which can only be explained by the effect of the examples which those who composed the new matter had before them.†

Some time after the meeting of bishops and clergy summoned to receive the English Prayer-book, which has been described, St. Leger was recalled from his vice-royalty, and was succeeded by Sir James Crofts, who, desirous of inducing acquiescence in the views of the English Government, invited Archbishop Dowdall, the

---

\* All these collects will be found in the Sarum Missal. They can be traced from that to collections now upwards of twelve hundred years old. Some are to be found in the Sacramentary of Leo (Pope, 440–461), some in that of Gelasius (Pope 492–496), and the rest in that of Gregory the Great (Pope 590–604.)

† In the Roman Catholic Church also there has been a revision of the old Services. The Missal now in use is of this character: formed after the Council of Trent, under the authority of Pope Pius V., and with additions by Popes Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. This revision is characterized by additions to the old uses; the Protestant revision rather by omissions from them, with, however, additions also.



chief opponent of the new Prayer-book, to a conference. This afterwards took place at St. Mary's Abbey, and after much debate was terminated by the latter saying, "It was all in vain when two parties so contrary met; and that the Lord Deputy's pains were only lost." The Bishops of Meath (Staples) and Kildare (Lancaster) attended Crofts at this interview. The discussion was carried on between Dowdall and Staples. The former urged the antiquity of the Mass; the latter that the Prayer-book was but the Mass reformed.

In consequence of the course taken by Archbishop Dowdall, an Act of the King and Council of England deprived Armagh of the Primacy, and transferred it to the See of Dublin. Subsequently, Dowdall left the country, whether voluntarily in resentment of this treatment, or being banished, is not certain; but whichever was the case, the King, dealing with the bishopric as vacant, appointed to it an English ecclesiastic named Goodacre, who, together with Bale, another Englishman then nominated to Ossory, was consecrated (February, 1553) by Archbishop Browne, assisted by the bishops of Kildare and Down, in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin. For this consecration a Service, which was sanctioned in England some time after the Prayer-book had been printed, was used, Bale having insisted that this should be done, although no proclamation to authorize the form in Ireland had been issued by the Viceroy.

Beside Goodacre and Bale, Edward, during his short reign, appointed the following Bishops: Lancaster, Dean of Ossory, to Kildare; Travers to Leighlin; Casey, a clergyman of the diocese, to Limerick; and Walsh, a person of native descent, to Waterford. All nominated

by Edward were, it may be assumed, more or less Protestant in opinion. Bale was extremely hostile to Rome. Walsh alone of Edward's appointments on vacancies seems to have ever been recognized at Rome.

Some time before 1551 a printing press was first introduced into Ireland; and it was in this year employed to print for the Government an edition of the new Prayer-book. This professed to be issued by commandment of St. Leger, late Lord Deputy, and of the Council; but as it contained at the end a prayer for Crofts by name, who is described as "now governor over this realm under our most dread sovereign Lord Edward VI.,"\* its actual publication was during the rule of the latter.

When Crofts was sent over, he was directed to have the Services of the English Prayer-book translated into Irish for the use of those places where ignorance of the English tongue rendered this requisite in order to their being used. Unfortunately this injunction was not carried out, and no Irish version of them was then made.

Before King Edward's death the Prayer-book, which had been enacted by the English Parliament in 1549, was subjected to revision. The result was a new Book, which received the sanction of Parliament, and is known as King Edward the Sixth's second Prayer-book. The revision was caused by the increased diffusion in Eng-

---

\* A copy of this edition of the Prayer-book is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. It was the first book ever printed in Dublin. Its title-page is, "The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church: after the use of the Church of England."

land of the doctrinal views of the Continental Reformers, and by the dissatisfaction felt by those who adopted them, with some matters contained in the King's first Prayer-book. The second Prayer-book was never introduced or used in the Irish Church, probably owing to the early death of Edward; but as upon it was framed the Prayer-book of Queen Elizabeth, which was afterwards adopted, and the use of it enforced in the Irish Church, it seems expedient to allude to some of the alterations which were then made in the Services.

The first of these was in the Morning and Evening Services.\* In them it was directed that at the beginning the minister should read "some one of the sentences of Scripture that follow, and that then he should read the Exhortation, the General Confession, and the Absolution," just as they are now in the Morning and Evening Services of the English Prayer-book. In the Baptismal Service the abjuration, investing with a chrisom, and anointing the child, directed in the first Book of Edward VI., were omitted; so also was any reference to anointing in the Visitation of the Sick. In the Burial Service, the parts connected with an administration of the Communion, and the prayer that the deceased person's sins should not be imputed to him, were omitted. Offices for Ordination, which had been separately issued after the first Book was published, were now annexed to the other Services. In the Communion Service, which was no longer described as "commonly called the Masse," there were several variations. The Ten-Commandments were to be read. From the "prayer

---

\* I have followed the edition of this Prayer-book, printed at London in 1552, which, like Edward's first, has lately been reprinted in London.



for the whole state of Christ's Church," as given in Edward's first Prayer-book, were omitted the clause which offered a thanksgiving for "the grace and virtue declared in the saints, and in the most blessed Virgin Mary" (of whom no mention was now made), and also the clause commending to God's mercy those who had departed hence with the sign of faith. In the Communion Service, at the consecration of the elements, for the words "with thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts," &c., were substituted the words "grant that wee, receyving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Sonne our Savioure Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood." In the same Service the direction to put water in the wine was not continued; the words prescribed in the first Book for the ministers, when delivering the elements, were expunged; and they were replaced by the second of the clauses now in use. Several of the former rubrics were omitted; others were altered; in none of them was the Communion-table called (as previously it had been in some) an altar. The terms "the Lorde's table," and "God's boord," which had also before been used, were still retained. In the rubrics at the end of the Communion Service was introduced an explanation that by kneeling at the reception of the Communion was not "meant that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real or essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood."\*

---

\* See as to the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. p. 40, *supra*.



During the reign of Edward VI. no event of importance connected with civil affairs occurred in Ireland. The peace which his father had established in the Irish districts was maintained; but the apparent tranquillity and concord were not real; and the native portion of the population continued—notwithstanding their quietude and seeming acquiescence—to be as little reconciled to the English Government as they had been in the time of the older English kings.

It is to be observed that under Edward VI. Parliament neither met nor was summoned in Ireland. The reason for this omission was probably an apprehension lest, while the King was a minor, more independence might be shown in its proceedings than was consistent with the authority until that time at least for legislative purposes claimed by, and conceded to, the English Government.

## CHAPTER IV.

[1553-1558.]

WITH the death of Edward the Sixth (July 6, 1553) there ensued a complete change in the ecclesiastical policy of the Crown in England. His sister Mary, who succeeded him upon the throne, was the daughter of Catherine of Arragon, and had been brought up as a member of the Church of Rome. To its religious system she was conscientiously most strongly attached; and even had she been less so, the proceedings which had taken place upon her father's quarrel with the Pope, involving, as they did, the divorce of her own mother, were certain to provoke her resentment. Notwithstanding her very decided opinions, and that they were well known, the Queen seems, after her accession to the throne, to have been in authoritative documents described as "Head of the Church." In communications on that occasion from the English Privy Council to Ireland she is termed, "on earth supreme head of the Churches of England and Ireland."\*

---

\* Morrin, p. 304. Mary herself disapproved of the title "Head of the Church." In a letter to Pole, Oct. 28, 1553, she expresses her fears that she would be pressed to retain it. *Veremur ne, pertinacius quam desideraremus, insistant et urgeant, ut titulum supremi capitis ecclesiæ continuemus et assumamus* (cited in Stubbs' edition of Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 216).

Mary found little difficulty in re-establishing the Church of Rome with its old authority in England, either from Parliament or the Convocations. The only matter which she could not accomplish was the restoration to the Church of the lands and tithes of the monasteries and convents, which had been confiscated by Henry, and were by him granted away to new owners. What had remained of them in the hands of the Crown as yet undisposed of, as also the First Fruits and Tenths, she voluntarily, of her own authority, restored for ecclesiastical uses.

When Mary had determined upon her policy for England she, imitating in this her father and brother, proceeded to adopt the same in Ireland. One of her first acts in furtherance of her design was to restore Dowdall—who, as we have seen, had been dispossessed under Edward VI.—to the Archbishopric of Armagh, and to uphold the Primacy of that See, which, from the time when this prelate was dispossessed, had not been acknowledged.

The death of Goodacre, who was by Edward VI. substituted for Dowdall, occurring before the Queen's accession, relieved the restoration of Dowdall from the opposition which would probably otherwise have come from Goodacre and from some of the more decided opponents of Rome.

The proceedings adopted during this reign against such bishops of the Church of England as were of the Protestant or reforming party, eventuating in the martyrdom of the most distinguished of them, are events so often narrated and so well-known that there is no need to repeat them here. In Ireland a less severe

course was adopted. It was thought enough to cause vacancies in the Sees of those Prelates who were known to conscientiously hold Protestant tenets, so as to enable the appointment in their places of ecclesiastics unquestionably friendly to Rome. Measures, therefore, for that purpose were adopted, founded upon bishops having married—conduct inconsistent with the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore, it was argued, calling for the forfeiture of their offices. The result was that Browne, Archbishop of Dublin; Lancaster, Bishop of Kildare; and Travers, Bishop of Leighlin, were deprived. Two other bishops anticipated removal by flying from the country—Bale, Bishop of Ossory, and Casey, Bishop of Limerick.\*

When the five Sees were thus vacated there were appointed—Curwin, a native of Westmoreland, and then Dean of Hereford, to Dublin; Walsh, a Cistercian monk, to Meath; Leverous, who had been a chaplain to the Earl of Kildare, to Kildare; O'Fihil (anglicized Field), a Franciscan friar, to Leighlin; Lacy, or Lees, a canon of Limerick, to Limerick; and Thonory to Ossory. For the Archbishopric of Cashel, which, though vacant before Edward's death, had remained unfilled,

---

\* The subsequent history of these five prelates was—that (as will be presently mentioned) Browne soon died; that Casey was restored by Queen Elizabeth in 1571, in the room of the person appointed by Mary in his place. Some writers consider Lancaster a different person from Lancaster, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, but from Cal. S. P. Ir. 1509–1573, p. 371, he seems the same. Bale was one of the prelates named in the warrant for the consecration of Archbishop Parker in England, and he accepted from Queen Elizabeth a prebend in Canterbury Cathedral. Why Travers was not restored does not appear.



Roland Fitz Gerald, called Le Baron, was, pursuant to a Queen's Letter, elected by the Dean and Chapter.\*

Browne, soon after he was deprived, died. He was unquestionably the most able agent concerned in the introduction of the Reformation into Ireland. He is described as "a man of a cheerful countenance, in his acts and deeds plain and downright, to the poor merciful and compassionate, pitying the state and condition of the souls of the people." He has not, however, escaped censure. He was reproved by Henry VIII. for negligence of duty, "elation of mind and pride." Staples, Bishop of Meath, who was of his own party in ecclesiastical affairs, also at one time complained of him. On the other hand there exist contemporary testimonies to his zeal and to the merits of his preaching.† By writers of a later period he has been condemned for unduly exalting the authority of the Crown, resting the case against Rome too much upon it. But this was not peculiar to him: similar ideas were popular with the Protestant party in England, and Cranmer himself went very far in the same direction.

Mary's adoption of a new ecclesiastical policy in Ireland was acceptable to the native Irish. Their Chieftains never professed to follow her father and brother farther than admitting the supremacy of the Crown—an admission which they made along with their professions of allegiance, and which, like these professions, they would respect while they were weak, and be certain to repudiate when strong. Neither they

---

\* See as to these appointments Note N of Appendix.

† See especially a letter of Lord James Butler to Henry VIII., 1538, printed in *State Papers*, Henry VIII., vol. ii. p. 563.

nor the septs ruled, and wholly in opinion, just as much as in acts, guided by them, thought of adopting any new notions upon religious questions. The same would be the case also with many Anglo-Irish, who had merely externally conformed to what was required by Henry and Edward. How many there may have been who, under Mary's rule, continued faithful to the cause of the Reformation there are no means of estimating.

Henry had been able to induce the Irish Parliament to adopt his measures in relation to the Church of Ireland. Mary, who was about to have her father's statutes on that subject repealed, was certain of finding equal, or greater, readiness on the part of the same assembly to carry out her views. Accordingly in the third year of her reign she convened a Parliament, which was held at Dublin. Upon its meeting, a Bull, which had been issued by Pope Paul IV., pronouncing absolution for the separation of Ireland under Henry and Edward from the Church of Rome, was read by Archbishop Curwin to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal. It, however, confirmed the dispositions of benefices, marriages, dispensations, and other ecclesiastical proceedings, and the dealings with Church lands, that had taken place during the separation. An Act was then unanimously passed repealing all "statutes and provisions made against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of King Henry VIII.; and also for the establishment of spiritual and ecclesiastical possessions and hereditaments conveyed to the laity." Besides, the Queen made gifts to laymen of lands derived by the Crown from the monasteries. Thus the loss to the Church occasioned by Henry's grants of property acquired from

these sources was not at all redressed; and the practical effect of the measures of this reign extended in Ireland little beyond restoring the use of the Latin Liturgies instead of the English Prayer-book.

Notwithstanding the persecution of Protestants in England under Mary, there is no record of anyone having suffered for religion in Ireland during her reign; and it is related that, so far as questions of that nature were concerned, the social condition of the country was sufficiently tranquil to induce English Protestants from Cheshire to come and reside in Dublin.

Among, however, the statutes of the Irish Parliament in this reign was one reviving the old laws against heresy; and it was said that shortly before Mary's death it was intended to put in force these laws by means of a Commission for the purpose issued by the Queen. The failure of the design was attributed to the abstraction at Chester of the document which contained the Commission from the person who had charge of it.\* A story to this effect was, certainly, in the next reign current. The narrative does not, however, suggest that the Commission was sought by the Irish Government, or that it had any other origin than the policy of the Queen and her English Ministers, with whose proceedings in England it would have been in perfect consistency.

The harmony between Mary and her Irish subjects upon religious questions did not lead to any alteration in the political relations of the two countries. The old

---

\* The story, and the authorities for it, are published with much circumstantiality of detail in Robert Ware's *Life of Archbishop Browne*. See Appendix, Note O.



disturbances revived; the old proceedings to put them down were resumed.\* But upon success an entirely new mode of dealing with the vanquished was now initiated. The territories of the defeated septs, and not merely the seigniories and rights of their chieftains, were held to be forfeited to the Crown, which therefore was entitled to dispose of them as if they were its own possessions, and to allot them among English settlers.

The first example of plantation (as colonization in this manner came to be called) was upon the subjugation of the tribes known as the O'Moores, O'Connors, and O'Dempseys. They occupied districts adjoining counties of the Pale. The chief of these districts were then known as Leix and Offaly. They were confiscated and converted into two counties, named thenceforward, from Mary and her husband Philip, King of Spain, the Queen's and King's Counties, in each of which a fort was erected, and by degrees around the forts small towns formed; the fort and town in the former being designated Maryborough, and in the latter Philipstown.

Contemporaneously a statute† was passed by the Irish Parliament which empowered the Lord Deputy to grant

---

\* Sir Richard Cox having remarked the zeal of Queen Mary for her religion, observes:—"Yet the Irish were not quieter during her reign than they were under her brother; but, on the contrary, their antipathy against Englishmen and Government induced them to be as troublesome then as at other times, and prevailed with Mr. Sullivan to give this severe character of her reign—that although the Queen was zealous to propagate the Catholic religion, yet her ministers did not forbear to injure and abuse the Irish. Quæ tametsi Catholicam religionem tueri et amplificare conata est, ejus tamen præfecti et conciliarii injuriam Ibernis inferre non desistiterunt."—*Anglicana Hibernia*, p. 309.

† 3 & 4 P. and M., ch. 1 (Irish). The preamble of this Act recites—"Whereas the countries of Leix, Slewmerge, Offallie, Irie, and



the lands situate in these counties for estates in fee-simple, or of more limited tenure, as, in order to “the more sure planting and strength of the countries with good subjects, should be thought in his wisdom and discretion meet and convenient.”\* The statute was acted upon until the Queen’s death, but not to any considerable extent; the number of new inhabitants brought upon the confiscated lands being, when compared with their dimensions, small. Those who came were scattered too much apart, and were consequently exposed to the incursions of the former owners who had been removed to make way for them, without being able to combine together for mutual protection.

Another Act, also affecting the position of the native Irish, was passed about the same time as the statute relating to Leix and Offaly. It enabled what were termed in it “waste grounds,” that is, lands which were not as yet shire land, to be divided into counties, shires, and hundreds.†

Both this statute and the policy of forming “plantations” which was adopted along with it, were calculated

---

Glynmalier, which belong of right to the King and Queen’s most excellent Majesties, were of late possessed by the Moores, the Connors, the Dempseys, and other rebels, and now by the industrious travaile of the Earl of Sussex, now Lord Deputy of Ireland, be brought again to be in the possession of their Majesties, and so remain, to be disposed as to their Highnesses shall be thought good: forasmuch as the well disposing of the aforesaid countries and planting of good men there shall not only be a great strength to those quarters, but also a wonderful assurance of quiet to all the rest of the English countries, and a great terror to all the Irish countries bordering upon the same.”

\* The use of the word “planting” in this statute should be noticed. It introduced the practice and the name for it.

† 3 & 4 Philip and Mary, ch. 3.

to effect great social changes. To convert a territory into counties was the preliminary to enforcing English law, and an English mode of administering justice. To plant was to substitute entirely new owners and occupiers. Heretofore the course pursued had been to leave the Irish parts of the island without interfering with their inhabitants, or abrogating their customs or regulations as to the possession of land. Whenever any portions of them fell, after an unsuccessful rebellion or otherwise, within the power and disposal of the Crown, it was deemed sufficient to set over them new paramount Chieftains. Anglo-Normans ruled in place of native Irishmen; inferior rights were not touched; the old services and duties continued to be rendered; the change was only in the persons who were to receive them. Henceforward the titles of all persons having interests in the lands of a rebel chieftain, whether primary or derivative, came to be regarded as involved in the consequences of a forfeiture; and all claiming through or under the attainted superior owners and rulers were liable to be dispossessed.

That the Irish districts sent no members to Parliament; that neither directly nor indirectly was their assent given to this mode of proceeding, formed no objection to it in the minds of English statesmen of the sixteenth century. They held that the more powerful and victorious nation had the right to legislate for the defeated and subordinate; to take their lands, and, when they had been taken, to distribute them. Looking solely to the interests of their own country, they perceived the advantage of introducing in Ireland allies instead of enemies, civilization in lieu of barbarism, and of effecting these

improvements by means which provided for those who, unemployed, were troublesome at home : they overlooked, or, if they saw, they disregarded, the consideration that arbitrary acts of this character alienate the affections of the subject race from the governing, spread through the community a sense of insecurity, and finally create the impatient discontent that predisposes to disloyalty and rebellion.

## CHAPTER V.

[1558-1603.]

QUEEN ELIZABETH, when, upon the death of her sister Mary, she came to the throne, proceeded after a slight delay, which was employed with judgment in conciliating popularity and strengthening her own influence, to determine what course it was proper to pursue in reference to ecclesiastical affairs, and ultimately resolved that the policy which had been adopted in the reigns of her father and of her brother Edward should be revived.

In what proportion the people of England were at this time divided between the old and the new religious systems there are no satisfactory modes of determining ; and, as might under these circumstances be anticipated, historians disagree upon the question : some holding that those who favoured Protestantism formed a majority of the people ; others that the Roman Catholics were the more numerous ; and others that there was a zealous Protestant party, a zealous Roman Catholic, and an intermediate, which, according to events and the political considerations arising from them, might be swayed to either side.\*

---

\* See Hallam, *Const. Hist.* vol. i. p. 137, note. Lingard, *Hist., Reign of Elizabeth*, ch. 7. Macaulay, *Essay on Lord Burleigh*.



But whatever may have been the number of those who adhered to each religion, circumstances and the position which the Reformers occupied in the country aided the progress of Protestantism, and tended to procure for it superior influence. The strength of the Roman Catholic interest lay partly in the northern counties, which, remote from the seat of government, were then the least important, and partly in the agricultural districts, where the population was scattered over a wide surface. On the other hand, in London and the more populous towns the principles of the Reformation were in the ascendant, especially among the trading and manufacturing classes, who were the most active and intelligent portion of the people, and had for some time been acquiring wealth and power.

It was probably owing to these causes that, when the Queen's first Parliament met, and measures repealing the ecclesiastical statutes of the preceding reign were brought forward, the House of Commons was found (although not without division of opinion) willing to pass them; and that in the end, notwithstanding opposition from the bishops, enactments were obtained which a second time severed the connexion of the English Church with the See of Rome, and permanently impressed a Protestant character upon its constitution and formularies.

Of this legislation the most important part was a new Supremacy Act. It substantially agreed with the former statutes in relation to this subject, and, like them, prohibited any foreign prince, person, prelate, or potentate from exercising or enjoying any manner of jurisdiction, authority, pre-eminence, or privilege, spiritual or

temporal, within the realm, or any other Her Majesty's dominions. There was, however, one important particular in which the Act varied from the Supremacy Act of Henry VIII. In the oath of supremacy which was now imposed, the Queen was described, not as before by the terms "head in earth of the Church of England," but by the words, "the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other Her Highness's dominions, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal."

The substitution of the word "governor" was made in deference to the objections which had from the first been by many urged against the use of the words "Head of the Church," and were now again raised and renewed. Among those who objected was Elizabeth herself. "She is unwilling," Jewell wrote to Bullinger, "to be addressed in speaking or in writing, as Head of the Church of England, for when the title was proposed she earnestly answered that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being whatever."\*

The Statute also contained a provision not before enacted, which confined "heresy" to what had been adjudged such by the authority of the canonical scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council wherein the same was so declared by the express and plain words of the

---

\* Juellus ad Henricum Bullingerum. "Regina non vult appellari aut scribi caput ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; graviter enim respondit, &c."—*Jewell's Works*, published by Parker Society, p. 1211. It appears, from the correspondence of the Spanish Ambassador, that Elizabeth told him she would not be called "Head of the Church."—Froude, *Hist.*, vii. 67, 69.

said canonical scriptures, or to what should thereafter be adjudged such by Parliament with the assent of the clergy in their convocation.

Notwithstanding the alteration in the oath prescribed, considerable misunderstanding of the meaning and effect of the Supremacy Act continued; and accordingly it was deemed advisable to take advantage of "injunctions" which were issued from the Queen to persons selected to hold visitations through the country, and publish in them "that the Queen's subjects were not to give ear to those who said that any power of ministry in divine things might be challenged under her laws for kings and queens; that only the same authority was claimed that had been used under her father and brother, and is and was due to the queen, that is, under God to have the sovereignty over all manner of persons within the Queen's realms and dominions, of what estate, ecclesiastical or temporal, they be, so that no foreign power should have superiority over them."

Although it was not until a later period of Elizabeth's reign that the Articles of Religion, now known as the Thirty-nine Articles, were framed for the Church, it seems most convenient here to mention that the subject of the Supremacy was explained in one of them (xxxvii.). The language of this Article agrees with the "injunctions"; and it states that the "Queen's majesty hath the chief power in the realm of England and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, and ought not to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction"; and then it adds, that "where we attribute to the Queen's majesty



the chief government, we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of the sacraments; but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evildoers."\*

The same Parliament which passed the Supremacy Act re-established English Services in the churches, instead of the Latin that had been restored by Mary. The second Prayer-book of Edward VI. revised, and in some respects altered, was ordered to be used. Of these alterations the most important were in connexion with the Communion Service. For the first time the two clauses now used in administering the elements were joined together, one only having been in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., and the other only in his Second Book. The explanation at the end of the Communion Service, that, by the direction it should be received "kneeling," adoration was not intended, was

---

\* In Protestant monarchical countries where the supremacy of the Pope is repudiated, there are reasons of policy for asserting such a supremacy for the Crown, as is explained in the thirty-seventh Article; otherwise, there is great risk of disunion, of empire within empire. The Crown's greatness is the greatness of the nation; and being, according to the explanation given in the Articles, secular in character, it expresses the power of the laity, and their authority in the Church.

Bishop Harold Browne (commenting on Article xxxvii.) says the Eastern Church admits the Supremacy of the Crown. At a synod of bishops held in Greece in 1833 it was resolved that spiritually the Head is Christ, but with respect to the administration of the Church, the King of Greece is head (Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introduction, p. 60).

See further as to the question of the Supremacy, Note P of Appendix.



omitted. This change aimed at conciliating the Roman Catholic party ; so did also an omission from the Litany of the suffrage, which had been in both Edward's Prayer-books, for deliverance from the Bishop of Rome. Prayers were added for the Queen and clergy.\* Dress and habits were to be as they were allowed at the time of Edward's first Prayer-book, until order should take place therein, under the authority of the Queen, with the advice of the Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical. In the Ordinal the oath imposed was called "the Oath of the Queen's sovereignty," whereas in both the Prayer-books of Edward it was called "the othe of the kyng's supremacy."†

When the supremacy of the Crown and the use of the new Prayer-book in the Church of England had been established, a Parliament was called in Ireland, in order that by its assistance similar results might be there attained. This Parliament met in the month of January, 1560. It was constituted in the following manner : The House of Lords was composed of lay peers and bishops, the House of Commons of lay representatives from counties, cities, and boroughs. If all bishops who seem to have been entitled to sit attended they would number twenty ; if all Lords temporal, twenty-three. The names of fifty-six citizens and burgesses from twenty-eight cities and boroughs are preserved ; so also are the names of twenty knights from counties. They were returned from ten counties, viz. Dublin, Meath, Westmeath, Louth, Kildare, Carlow, Kilkenny, Waterford,

---

\* These were derived from Pope Gregory's Sacramentary.

† See as to the first and second Prayer-books of Edward VI., pp. 41 and 47, *supra*.

Tipperary, and Wexford.\* Of the proceedings of this Parliament, except the Acts which were passed by it, there is no record. These Acts related to the Supremacy, the Prayer-book, the First Fruits and Twentieths, and the Appointment of Bishops.

The Supremacy Act which was now passed followed the new English Act, and, like it, omitted in the form of oath, when speaking of the Queen, the phrase "Head of the Church," and substituted the words "the only Supreme Governor of this realm, and of all other Her Highness's dominions and countries, in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as well as temporal." The oath was to be taken by every person then or afterwards holding ecclesiastical or civil office, on pain of not being admitted to the office, or, if in possession, of forfeiting it. Persons advisedly and maliciously speaking or writing in defence of the pre-eminence or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of any foreign prince or potentate, were to be held guilty of offences, and subject to most severe punishments, involving on a third offence the penalties for treason.† A difference in the Irish Act from the clause of the English Act relating to heresy is to be noted. The assent of Convocation was by the latter required to enable Parliament to define heresy, but in

---

\* The dissolution of the monasteries reduced the number of Peers by twenty-four, this being the number of abbots and priors who used to sit. Leland says that in the towns from which the citizens and burgesses came the royal authority was predominant. *History of Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 225. See further as to the constitution of this Parliament Note Q of Appendix.

† 2 Eliz., chap. 1 (Irish), A.D. 1560, entitled: "An Act restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same."

the Irish Act there is no reference to the assent of Convocation or of any other ecclesiastical assembly.

The Act relating to the Prayer-book introduced into Ireland the book which, as has been mentioned, had been enacted by the English Parliament in the first year of the Queen.\* Its principal provisions were the following: It recited, that at the death of King Edward VI. there remained one uniform order of common service, prayer, and administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, set forth in one book, authorized by Act of Parliament of the fifth and sixth years of the same king, *i.e.* Edward's second Prayer-book; and that this was repealed and taken away by an Act of Mary. It then enacted that all and singular ministers in any cathedral or parish church, or other place within the realm of Ireland, should say and use the matins, even-song, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and administration of each of the sacraments and all other common and open prayer, in such order and form as in said book mentioned, but with such alterations and additions as were therein set forth. These were the same as had been ordered to be made in the Prayer-book for the Church of England.

The use in the churches in Ireland of the Services thus authorized was enjoined under severe penalties; and attendance on Divine worship was enforced by fines for absence of twelve pence for each such offence, to be levied by the churchwardens for the benefit of the poor.

This Act contained the singular provision that, if the minister or priest had not knowledge of the English

---

\* 2 Eliz., chap. 2 (Irish), A.D. 1560.



tongue, he might say the new services in Latin. The reason assigned in the Act for this was, that in most places there could not be found English ministers to serve in the churches, and that if those who did serve were to use such language as they understood, the due honour of God would be advanced; and “that the same might not be in their native language, as well for difficulty to get the services printed in Irish, as that few in the whole realm could read the Irish letters.”

It is also to be noticed that the Act did not leave the character of the ornaments of buildings, or the dress of the clergy, to be determined by a rubric, but expressly provided that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof should be retained, and be in use, as were in the Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of Edward VI., until other order should be therein taken by the authority of the Queen’s majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England or of Ireland for causes ecclesiastical; or by the authority of the Lord Deputy or other governor or governors of the realm of Ireland for the time being, with the advice of the Council of said realm under the Great Seal thereof, with power to the same authority with the like notice, and in the circumstances therein mentioned, “to ordain and publish such further ceremonies or rites as might be most for the advancement of God’s glory, the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ’s holy mysteries and sacraments.”

The Act relating to the First Fruits and Twentieths gave back to the Crown these sources of revenue of which by a statute of the late reign it had been



deprived;\* Appropriations, also, then taken from the Crown, were re-annexed to its possessions. These restitutions were prefaced by a recital that the late Queen had willed to relinquish the rights now resumed "by procurement of King Philip, her late husband, upon zealous and inconvenient respects, and not having due regard to the maintenance and good continuance of the state of the Imperial Crown in succession, which rather needed augmentation than any diminution."

The Act regulating appointments to bishoprics provided that they were to be made by patents under the Great Seal, consequent upon instructions or letters missive from the Queen and her successors, instead of, as in England, by the Deans and Chapters of the Sees, who, when electing, had to act in obedience to recommendations from the Crown, which, as they might not be disobeyed, were in effect mandates.† It was thought that in the unsettled state of the Irish Church any reference to the Chapters might lead to conflicts between the Queen and these Corporations; and that it was therefore better the office of bishop should be granted directly from the Crown.

The Deputy, when the Parliament of 1560 met, was Lord Sussex. By him, as soon as the legislation he

\* See 3 and 4 P. and M., ch. 10.

† 2 Eliz., chap. 4 (Irish), A.D. 1560. This Act recited that, "elections of archbishops and bishops, by deans and chapters within the realm of Ireland, were to the delay and costs of such persons" as the queen appointed; and that these elections were "in very deed no elections, but only by a writ of *congé d'eshire*, had colours, shadows, or pretences of elections, serving to no purpose, and seeming also derogatory and prejudicial to the Queen's prerogative royal, to whom appertaineth the collation of all archbishoprics and bishoprics within her said realm."

desired had been obtained, it was dissolved, he himself returning to England. After a short time Sussex was again sent back as Lord Lieutenant, and in about three weeks after he had been sworn into office he received a letter from the Queen, "signifying," as it is reported, "her pleasure for a general meeting of the clergy of Ireland, and the establishment of the Protestant religion through the several dioceses of that kingdom." \*

The direction to convene an assembly of the clergy was probably prompted by a desire that the new Prayer-book which the Irish Parliament had enacted should be introduced by Sussex to the bishops and clergy, just as the first Prayer-book of Edward the Sixth had been brought before them by St. Leger. As the Queen's representative, Sussex could then authoritatively recommend the use of its Services. The result was that a meeting of bishops, or more probably of bishops and clergy, was held in the third year of the Queen's reign.† No record remains of the names of the persons who actually attended, or of the precise nature of the proceedings which took place when the assembly met, further than that one of the bishops, Walsh of Meath, is reported to have been "enraged with her majesty's proposals," and "after the assembly had dispersed themselves," to have preached against the new Prayer-book. As he alone of the bishops is mentioned to have dissented from the Deputy's suggestions, the acquiescence of such others as were present may not unreasonably be inferred. When introducing his eccle-

---

\* Sir James Ware's *Annals*, A.D. 1560.

† Ware calls this meeting "an assembly of the Irish clergy." In the Loftus MSS. it is termed "a convocation of bishops." See Note Q of Appendix.

siastical policy Lord Sussex received the assistance of Curwin, who had been appointed Archbishop of Dublin and Lord Chancellor of Ireland by Queen Mary, and who now conformed, retaining both his offices. Leverous, bishop of Kildare, seems to have at once, and before the meeting took place, gone into opposition, refusing to take the oath of supremacy. His objections were, he represented, increased by its being required during the reign of a queen, for as ecclesiastical authority had not been conferred upon the Virgin Mary, the supremacy could not be meant for any other of her sex.\* He and Walsh (who persevered in his hostility to the new Prayer-book) were deprived of their offices.

What was the conduct of the bishops who were in possession of the other Sees, at Elizabeth's accession to the throne, has been a subject of controversy. Some of them owed their appointment to Mary: the rest had been allowed by her to remain when others were removed: all must have at least professed adherence to her views. These circumstances have been adduced to prove, not merely that these prelates were not Protestant in opinion (for which purpose they furnish most legitimate topics), but that none of them even professed an external con-

---

\* Leverous's argument is mentioned in Mason's *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral*, p. 163. It was first related in Bishop Rothe's *Analecta*, part iii., entitled, *de processu martyriali*, which has been lately reprinted at Dublin in a volume edited by Dr. Moran, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, N.S.W. In 1580, Lord Baltinglass repeated Leverous's ideas. "Questionless" (he said), "it is a great want of knowledge, and more of grace, to think and believe, that a woman, uncapax of all holy orders, should be the supreme governor of Christ's Church: a thing that Christ did not grant unto his own mother." (Letter to Lord Ormonde, July, 1580, *Cal. Carew MSS.*, 1575-1588, p. 289.)



formity. How little they can be relied upon to support the latter inference Curwin is a decisive example. He served Mary and he served Elizabeth. No one can doubt that, both in England and Ireland, many others acted in the same manner as Curwin did; nor has there ever been a period of change and transition in which conduct of this character has not extensively prevailed.\* Why, too, if there was not compliance, was there not deprivation? Bishops of remote dioceses would probably escape notice or interference from the government, but if those within its reach imitated Walsh and Leverous, it is in the highest degree improbable that they would not have received the same punishment.

The actual evidence bearing upon the question we are now considering is meagre and unsatisfactory; but, as far as it reaches, the conclusions to be drawn from it seem to agree with what the probabilities of the case would lead us to expect. It shows several bishops beside Curwin placed in political offices of trust, not likely to have been confided to them unless they had

---

\* St. Leger and Sussex present examples of the readiness with which those who do not feel deeply on religious questions accommodate themselves to changes of policy in respect of them. These statesmen served as the Chief Governors in Ireland under both Mary and Elizabeth, and carried out the quite opposite views of these queens. The truth is that many, as well in England as in Ireland, had no decided opinions on the matters which at this period were the subject of controversy. Others did form such opinions, but had not courage to maintain their convictions, if their maintenance endangered person, property, or social station. Even Erasmus wrote of himself: "*Non omnes ad martyrium satis habent roboris; vereor autem, ne si quid inciderit tumultus, Petrum sim imitaturus. Pontificis ac Cæsaris bene decernentis sequor quod pium est: male statuentis fero quod tutum est. Id opinor etiam bonis viris licere, si nulla sit spes profectûs.*"—*ad Ricm. Pacæum*, vol. iii., 651 d. (ed. Lugd. Bat. 1703).



been, at least at the time of their appointment, in amicable relations with the Queen's Government.\*

The vacancies in Meath and Kildare, caused by the deprivation of Walsh and Leverous, were filled by the Queen, who selected for the latter Craik, Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and for the former, Hugh Brady—a native of the diocese over which he was placed—whose merits afterwards gained for him from Sir Henry Sidney the character of “an honest, zealous, and learned bishop, a holy minister for the gospel, and a good servant to the Queen.”

Elizabeth found the archbishopric of Armagh vacant, delayed long in appointing to it, and finally conferred it upon Adam Loftus, the chaplain to Lord Sussex, who, before leaving England, had attracted her notice.

Brady and Craik were appointed by patents. In the instance of Loftus, for some reason not satisfactorily explained, a writ of *congé d'eslire* was ordered to issue. In 1567 Curwin, Archbishop of Dublin, induced Elizabeth to translate him to the bishopric of Oxford in England, and Loftus was by the Queen moved to Dublin. The vacancy caused in Armagh by Loftus's translation to Dublin, and four succeeding vacancies in that See, all occurring during this reign, were filled by the Queen, these appointments being by patents. She also in the same manner filled all vacancies in the archbishoprics of Cashel and Tuam as they occurred; but in the instance of the former not upon the first occasion until after considerable delay. To suffragan bishoprics her ap-

---

\* See Note R of Appendix, where the conduct of Queen Mary's bishops at the accession of Elizabeth is more fully considered.

pointments were numerous. Of the dioceses, however, situate in the Irish districts, some during her entire reign, and others for long intervals, were, when vacant, left by her without any nominations being made.

The Queen's appointments to bishoprics were not accepted at Rome. The Popes, treating her acts as nullities, themselves provided\* (as this exercise of patronage by them was then called) for vacant Sees, but irregularly, since, in the case of two bishoprics vacant for twenty-six years before the death of Elizabeth, no nomination was, up to the time of that event, made from Rome, and in the case of others it was only after intervals of vacancy that successors were named.

The dioceses of Dublin, Kildare, and Meath—the first surrounding and the other two coming near the city of Dublin—were those in which Elizabeth, not merely by her episcopal appointments, but by every other means in her power, endeavoured to bring her ecclesiastical policy into operation. And in the part of the diocese of Dublin within the Pale, and parts of the dioceses of Kildare and Meath adjoining the diocese of Dublin, her exertions seem to have been attended with success.†

In the churches within these limits the new Services

---

\* Provision originally meant an appointment by the Pope to operate on a future vacancy, the grant of a reversionary right; then the phrase was extended to include filling a present vacancy. With the separate and conflicting appointments by the Crown and the Pope to Irish bishoprics during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, two distinct and rival episcopal successions commenced in Ireland. The subject will be considered in Note S of Appendix.

† The diocese of Kildare came within seventeen miles of the city of Dublin; the diocese of Meath within eleven miles.

were used, and the parishioners, for the most part Anglo-Irish, continued to attend them as they did before. No doubt the fines imposed for non-attendance by the statute which enacted the new Prayer-book contributed to this result; but the really effective causes were the example of the parochial clergy, the influence of Government, and sympathy with English thought and feeling naturally subsisting among persons of English descent. It is a significant fact that, when in 1566 a new English translation of the Bible was imported into Dublin, seven thousand copies were sold in two years.\*

Elizabeth's Government in Ireland has been charged with cruelty towards bishops appointed by the Popes; and the treatment of some of them unquestionably deserves to be thus characterised. But it would be a mistake to suppose that in these instances, or at all, during this reign, there was any persecution from motives merely connected with religion. Such punishments as were inflicted upon ecclesiastical persons arose out of a supposition which, whether rightly or erroneously, was entertained, that the persons condemned were engaged, or were about to engage, in

---

\* Ware in his *Annals* (Eliz. ch. ii.) thus states. He also says that this appears by the account of John Dale, a bookseller, who sold the Bibles for the booksellers of London, when they were first printed and brought over to Ireland, in the year 1566. He also mentions that Heath, Archbishop of York (himself friendly to the Roman Catholic party in England), sent to the two Deans of Dublin (viz. of St. Patrick's and Christ Church) two large Bibles, to be placed in the middle of their choirs, which, he says, caused "a great rush of people on purpose to read them." See as to attendance at church Carte's *Ormonde*, vol. i. p. 67; Leland, vol. ii. p. 381, *note*.



confederacies of the native Irish against the authority of the Crown of England.\* So far as religious profession was concerned, the Queen's policy both in England and Ireland favoured toleration; and even as to the supremacy, not many years had elapsed when, although some commissions were issued to obtain its acknowledgment, the general administration of the law became in Ireland negligent.† Controversial discussion in relation to Roman Catholic doctrines, and the use of contemptuous or severe language in speaking of them, Elizabeth discouraged; of which an illustration is recorded in the case of Jones, bishop of Meath. In 1587 this Prelate was reported to her for having in a sermon "inveighed in sharp and vehement sort against those that were of the Romain religion." She summoned him to London, and referred the sermon to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and not until the Archbishop certified that what was uttered in the sermon ought not to minister any just cause of offence, did she excuse the preacher.‡

---

\* See Froude, *History*, x. 482; xi. 262; Bagwell, *Tudors in Ireland*, ii. 357. Plowden, a Roman Catholic historian, says that "during the whole reign of Elizabeth in Ireland we read of no imprisonment, banishment, or execution of any priest for the sake of his religion," *History of Ireland*, vol. i. p. 331. There certainly is no reason to think that an Anglo-Irish Roman Catholic, supporting the English government, would have been molested because of his religion.

† The Commissions are stated in Morrin, i. 497, and ii. 252, 290. In the next reign the Lords of the Pale described the requirement of the oath of supremacy under Elizabeth as "sparingly and mildly carried on" (Leland, ii. 444).

‡ Letter from the Queen to the Lord Deputy, May 12, 1587, Morrin, ii. 125. In this letter she says that her directions were that "such a sharp manner of proceeding should be forborne by our clergy in Ireland." At a later date the instructions from the council to Lord Mountjoy were, to deal moderately in the matter of religion (Leland, ii. 383); and



Some time after the revision of the Prayer-book the standard of doctrine, known as the Thirty-nine Articles, was adopted in England by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and by the Parliament; but no proceeding was taken in Ireland at any time during the Queen's reign to introduce these Articles into the Irish Church. The Articles of Faith, which until the next reign were subscribed by the clergy in Ireland, on admission to benefices or curacies, were comprised in a collection published in Dublin in 1566 (as it is stated on the title-page), by authority of the Deputy and of the archbishops, and bishops, and other Her Majesty's High Commissioners.\* These Articles—eleven in number—were a copy of some framed by Archbishop Parker and other English bishops, and used in the English Church before the Thirty-nine Articles were authorised. Some Irish bishops may have required subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, but if so, this was without their being authorised by the Deputy, the Parliament, or any Synod.

These eleven Articles being so long in use deserve to be briefly summarised. The first stated the doctrine of the Trinity in explicit terms. The second asserted the

---

to Lord Grey the Queen gave a warning against being strict in dealing with religion (Froude, xi. 242).

\* The title-page is "A breefe declaration of certain principall Articles of Religion, set out by order and authoritie, as well of the right Hon. Sir Henry Sidney, General Deputie of this realme of Ireland, as by the archbyshopes and byshopes and other Her Majestie's High Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical, in the same realme. Imprinted at Dublin by Humfrey Powel, the 20th of January, 1566." There is a copy of this edition in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, supposed to be the only one extant. A Court of High Commission for Ireland had been appointed in 1563. See Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 42, *note*.

Scriptures to contain all things necessary to salvation, and professed belief in the Nicene, Athanasian, and Apostles' Creeds. The third related to the Church and its power to institute or vary ceremonies. The fourth defined who may lawfully take any office or ministry, ecclesiastical or secular. The fifth acknowledged the Queen's prerogative and superiority of government of all estates and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within this realm, and other her dominions, as in the late statute was expressed. The sixth declared the Bishop of Rome to have no more authority than other bishops have in their provinces and dioceses. The seventh assented to the Prayer-book set forth by the authority of Parliament. The eighth denied that certain ceremonies, which were formerly used at baptism, and had been then lately abolished, pertained to the substance of the rite. The ninth condemned private Masses, and the doctrine that the Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice. The tenth maintained the ministration of the Communion in both kinds. The eleventh disallowed the extolling of images, relics, and feigned miracles, and exhorted all men to the obedience of God's law and to the works of faith, of which examples were enumerated.\*

The Irish Supremacy Acts of Henry and Elizabeth, although varying in expression, were equally effective for the purpose of causing a separation from the Roman Catholic system. Both were inconsistent with the supremacy of the Pope, and with his being the paramount

---

\* A twelfth Article merely expressed assent to the others. Hence the Articles are quoted as "eleven." A reprint of the Dublin edition of 1566 is given in the Appendix to Elrington's *Life of Ussher*.

governor and ruler of all Christian Churches. But denial of his supremacy might, and for some time did, coexist with retention of the doctrinal opinions upheld at Rome, In Ireland, where the second Prayer-book of Edward VI. was never in use, Elizabeth's Prayer-book first marked a line of decided dissent from former views of theological questions. The divergence thereby manifested was made still more wide by the Articles which have just been cited. The Church in which they were brought into use was thenceforth in direct antagonism to the doctrinal teaching of Rome upon several distinct points of grave importance.

The want of schools which existed in every part of Ireland attracted, at an early period of Elizabeth's reign, the attention of her government, and led to an Act being obtained from Parliament which required "a free school" to be maintained in every diocese. The nomination of masters for these schools was given in the dioceses of Armagh, Dublin, Meath, and Kildare, to their respective bishops; in the others to the Lord Deputy. The salary of the master of each school was to be provided by a tax levied upon the Ordinary and clergy of the diocese.\*

At the period of the Reformation there was no University, nor was there even a collegiate institution of any importance, in Ireland. It was not until 1592 that this deficiency was supplied. The Queen then incorporated a college, to which she gave the name of Trinity College, with which an University was to coexist, supplied from the College with officers and

---

\* 12 Eliz. chap. 1 (Irish).



students, and entitled to confer upon these students the usual academic degrees. There were to be a Provost, Fellows, and Scholars: there was also to be a Chancellor.\* The first Provost and the first Chancellor were named in the charter; the former was Archbishop Loftus, and the latter Lord Burleigh, Elizabeth's great Minister. A building for the use of the College was erected near Dublin, the site and grounds around it being the gift of the Corporation of that city, to whom, with other property of a dissolved monastery, they had been granted after the suppression of the Religious Houses. There is no doubt that to serve the Church, by educating those who were to be its future clergy, was a prominent object sought in establishing the College,†

---

\* The effect of Elizabeth's charter, as regards the constitution of an University, is far from clear. It is not exactly defined whether the College and University are identical or distinct; nor, if distinct, whether the University was at once created, or was to be subsequently developed. Whatever was intended, the result practically came to be the same; for as Lord Chancellor Blackburne, when Vice-Chancellor of the University, decided, by means of the agency of the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor of the University and proper officers, for whose perpetual appointment the Crown made ample provision, the power to grant degrees was ensured. In the next reign, when the right of sending burgesses to Parliament was conceded, the existence of the University as a separate body was assumed, and it has ever since been acknowledged in the various charters and letters issued by the Crown. The charter describes the College as *mater universitatis*, a phrase which seems to indicate that there were two distinct bodies, and to refer, either to the College supplying the students to whom the University would grant its degrees, or to its supplying the persons who were to be its officers and members, or to both. See Dr. Todd's Preface to *List of Graduates*, published in 1869, and Sir Joseph Napiér's observations in the Supplement to it.

† "Ad bonas artes percipiendas colendamque virtutem et religionem" (Charter). The Fellows were to hold only for seven years, "ut alii in eorum locum succecti, pro hujus regni et ecclesiæ beneficio, emolumentum habeant."



but this did not confine the range of study, which extended to every department of literature and science.

In consequence of the intimate connexion between the State and the Reformed Churches of England and Ireland subsisting from the time of the Reformation, a history of either Church at any subsequent period would be incomplete without some reference to such contemporary events of a civil character as at the time affected the condition of the people. And this is especially the case in the instance of the Irish Reformed Church, because it was by the State that its system both of doctrine and ecclesiastical polity had been originally proposed and offered to the people, whose acceptance of it was certain very much to depend upon the relations of the State with them : being aided and advanced when those relations were amicable ; prevented, or at least hindered, when they were hostile or unfriendly.

Unfortunately, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the native Irish were not merely indisposed to receive with favour the recommendations of the English Government, but were arrayed in open warfare against it. No less than three rebellions were during this period maintained with such numbers and such military skill that, in order to overcome the insurgents, it was necessary to bring armies from England. They were the rebellion of Shane O'Neill soon after the Queen's accession, the rebellion of Desmond about thirty years later, and the rebellion of Tyrone (Hugh O'Neill) in the last years of the Queen's life. Twice were the rebels assisted by Spanish troops landed in Ireland. Once in battle were

the Queen's troops defeated.\* Beside these rebellions there were several—at least six—separate and distinct insurrections, each of which, although the local troops were found to be capable of defeating them, must be pronounced to have been of a most formidable character.†

To undo the effect of war, in producing the alienation of the Queen's Irish subjects from her government and their consequent resistance to its policy whether civil or ecclesiastical, it would have been necessary to have taken advantage of every interval of peace, and to have sedulously cultivated the good will of the conquered septs by concessions and kindness. An exactly opposite course was pursued, and victory was followed by much severity and even cruelty on the part of the soldiers of the Crown.‡

The ultimate result of the struggle by the native Irish to regain their independence, constantly renewed during Elizabeth's reign, was the establishment of English rule in Ireland. Tyrone was the last and most

\* At the battle of Blackwater, where Bagenal, who commanded the English, and fifteen hundred soldiers were slain (Leland, *History*, vol. ii. p. 349).

† "Queen Elizabeth sent over more men and spent more treasure to save and reduce the land of Ireland than all her progenitors since the Conquest. During her reign there arose three notorious and main rebellions, which drew several armies out of England: the first of Shane O'Neill, the second of Desmond, the last of Tyrone; for the particular insurrections of the Viscount Baltinglass, of Sir Edmund Butler, the Moors, the Cavanaghs, the Birnes, and the Bourkes of Connaught, were all suppressed by the standing forces here" (Sir John Davis, *Discoverie*, &c., p. 17).

‡ The wretched condition to which Munster, after an insurrection had been put down, was reduced has been described by Spenser in a description often cited, which it is even painful to read. (See *Tracts on Ireland*. Dublin, 1860, p. 525; and also Lecky, *History*, vol. ii. p. 96.)

powerful of the rebel chieftains. With his submission, in 1603, resistance to the Queen's authority terminated; but she did not herself live to take advantage of her success, and the opportunity which it presented of restoring to order the disturbed elements of which society in Ireland was then composed was reserved for her successor.

Something, however, was done in the Queen's lifetime towards enabling the introduction of English law, and the administration of justice by judges appointed by the Crown, to be extended to parts of the country they had not before reached. To the counties formed by King John, by Henry VIII., and by Philip and Mary,\* were added the following new counties:—Clare, Roscommon, Longford, Galway, Sligo, Mayo, Leitrim, Armagh, Monaghan, Tyrone, Coleraine, or Derry, Donnegal, Fermanagh, Cavan, Down, and Antrim. Moreover, Wicklow, distinctly separated from the County of Dublin in the next reign, was also recognised.

Elizabeth adhered to the policy of colonization introduced by Mary. She completed the plantation of the King's and Queen's Counties, which she found imperfectly carried out. Afterwards a colony was with her encouragement settled at Ards—a district now included in the County of Down. And on the attainder of Desmond vast territories in Munster which had been subject to him were granted to English owners, who were expressly bound to colonize them with English settlers, among whom were to be artizans, as well as farmers and labourers.

---

\* See pages 21, 56, *supra*. Meath was divided by Henry.

Beside, however, the colonists who were brought over in pursuance of schemes of plantation, many English, animated by a spirit of adventure (about this time very prevalent), established settlements in the country. Enterprising, not easily deterred by fatigue or danger, they added much to the strength of the Anglo-Irish population.



## CHAPTER VI.

### RETROSPECT.

THE termination of the reign of Queen Elizabeth—forty-five years after her accession to the throne, and sixty-six years after the first Irish Supremacy Act was passed—affords a convenient occasion to examine what effects were produced by the measures of Henry and Elizabeth in relation to ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland, what at the death of the latter was the condition of the Reformed Church, and what progress had the religious system which it represented then made among the people.

Before, however, entering upon these inquiries, the state and constitution of the Irish Church in 1536, when the Irish Parliament was summoned by Henry VIII. with the intention of procuring from it legislation in reference to the question of the Supremacy, will be considered; since, without this information for purposes of comparison, any estimate formed of the consequences of what was then enacted would be inadequate, and the investigation, therefore, proposed as the subject of this chapter could be pursued only imperfectly.

At this time the Church of Ireland acknowledged the Papal authority to be supreme, and accepted the

liturgies, ordinances, and tenets approved at Rome. It was, therefore, as a whole, in its quasi-corporate capacity, one and single. Notwithstanding, it cannot be regarded as perfectly undivided. On the contrary, the same causes which, as we have seen,\* separated the laity into two parts, according to the races from which they respectively were derived, operated to produce like effects among the clergy. In both instances two nationalities were kept alive. There were an Irish clergy and laity, moved by Irish ideas and feelings, which regarded Irish interests as not only distinct from but generally adverse to English, and which were concerned with advancing solely the former; and there were an English clergy and laity, equally imbued with the opinions and sympathies of the country whence their ancestors had come, and desirous of upholding its dominion in Ireland.

This division of opinion and sentiment—which probably more than any other circumstance influenced the course of events after 1536—although it did not originate in the policy of the English Government, had been by its action increased and maintained. At least from the reign of Edward III. the idea of fusing the inhabitants of the whole island, as subjects of one Crown, into one nation had been abandoned, and measures with an entirely different aim were adopted. Instead of endeavouring to Anglicise the Irish, these sought to guard the English from the contagion of Irish example, while the natives were left in the free indulgence of their own customs, and obedient to their own laws. By the famous Statute of Kilkenny, passed under this King, marriage, gossipred,

---

\* See page 20, *supra*.

fostering of children, between the English and Irish, were prohibited. No Englishman was to give or sell to any Irishman victuals in time of war, nor, whether in peace or war, horses or armour. Offences against these prohibitions were to amount to treason. By the same statute the admission of any "Irishman of the nations of the Irish" into any cathedral or collegiate church, or into any benefice, when such church or benefice was situate amongst "the English of the land" (by which word seems to have been meant the Pale), was made illegal and null, and the King could present upon the avoidance thus created.\*

But whatever separation may have been caused by the dissensions thus fostered, it did not extend beyond the social relations of the English and Anglo-Irish clergy between themselves. Their disagreements hindered their harmonious working together, but made no difference in the religious system or ecclesiastical regulations which either party upheld. Two distinct bodies, as it were, acted in parallel lines, obedient to the same paramount authority, equally desirous of maintaining it, with similar discipline and with similar principles of action.

Neither did these differences cause any variation in the organization of the Church as it existed over the whole island. Framed before any difference of nationality had arisen, that continued unaltered and uniform. The country, as was the case also in England, was divided into dioceses and parishes. There were thirty-

---

\* The Statute of Kilkenny is not in the Statute-book; it has been admirably edited by Mr. Hardiman, and is one of the publications of the Irish Archæological Society. The statute was frequently by the Irish Parliament re-enacted.



five Sees, but by consolidation and union they were at this time formed into four Archbishoprics and twenty-six Bishoprics.\* In twenty-nine Sees there were Corporations of Deans and Chapters. The clergy were very numerous, consisting not only of those living in the parishes, but also of a large number of members of monastic associations, who were in Holy Orders.

The Church (including within that term the monasteries and convents) possessed at this time a very large amount of endowments. Alike in the English and Irish districts extensive estates in lands had been dedicated to the maintenance of its organization; and tithes, of which the obligation was faintly, if at all, acknowledged at the time of the English Invasion,† were now an established and undisputed property belonging to ecclesiastical persons and institutions.

Comparing the two classes of the clergy—those connected with the parishes and those who belonged to the Religious Orders—the latter were much the more powerful and influential. For centuries the monastic system had prevailed in the Church of Ireland, and was especially venerated by the people. Of reverential and devotional temperament, they sympathized with ceremonial and ritual observances, and regarded with affectionate admiration those whose lives were dedicated to maintain them. Nor was it merely to their religious services that these societies owed their influence. All acknowledged that they had also conferred other benefits. To them it was due that in a period of barbarism civilization even existed. There were then

---

\* See further as to the Episcopate, Note T of Appendix.

† See Note U of Appendix.



neither educational nor charitable institutions; the monasteries and convents supplied their place. They were the inns, hospitals, colleges, and schools of the age.\*

Before the English settled in the country these societies were very moderately endowed. After that time the number and importance of their establishments increased. Old foundations were enlarged, and new of much greater magnitude erected. They became and were now extremely wealthy; for to the accumulated gifts of successive generations had been added numerous Appropriations from the parochial endowments. In this way more than one-sixth of the tithes of the entire island had been vested in them.†

There has been occasion already, when reviewing the condition of the English Church at the date of the Reformation, to observe upon the injurious consequences

---

\* See further as to the Religious Houses in Ireland, Note V of Appendix.

† Tithes belonging to private owners (impropriate, as they were called, in order to distinguish them from appropriate, *i.e.* those belonging to ecclesiastical corporations) were all derived from monastic property. According to the reports of the Royal Commission appointed in 1834 to inquire into the revenues of the Church of Ireland, the amount of compositions for impropriate tithes then came to £108,877 a-year, while those for the tithes of incumbents of parishes were £486,783 a-year, and of appropriators, £48,032 a-year. See Reports of 1836 and 1837. To estimate accurately the tithes owned by the religious houses, additions should, however, be made to the amount of impropriate tithes above stated, so as also to represent portions of them, which after Elizabeth's reign were restored by the Crown to the parishes out of which they accrued, or which were given to them by private bounty. See further as to the extent of the appropriations in Ireland, Mant. vol. i. pp. 355-370, and also pp. 373, 389, and the Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the unions in the Irish Church, dated 16th April, 1831.

to the parochial organization resulting from Appropriations.\* In almost every instance they withdrew from the parishes subjected to them a quite undue proportion of the tithes properly applicable to maintain the clergy ministering in the localities where they were paid. Accordingly, in general in these cases a most inadequate remuneration was left for the resident incumbents, whether vicars or curates—never more than enough to provide subsistence, and perhaps a few comforts, without any surplus for hospitality or the poor.

By such circumstances the character of the monastic and parochial clergy was necessarily affected. They operated to improve the former, and to deteriorate the latter. The superior endowments of the Religious Houses, the great respect with which they were regarded, aided the attractions of their peaceful and contemplative pursuits in drawing within them such of the clerical order as had any education or refinement: only those of an inferior grade would serve in the appropriated parishes; and the standard could not be lowered for so large a number without reducing the average level of the class from which they were taken.

But the superiority of the monastic over the parochial clergy was merely in social and intellectual position. Upon more important points—in relation to the discharge of the duties of their calling, and their own sense and practice of religion—the contemporary accounts of both are most unfavourable. The whole clerical order is described as completely secular in habits and pursuits, and entirely neglectful of their professional duties.† In the instance of the monasteries

---

\* See page 4, *supra*.

† See Note W of Appendix.

charges of a more grave character have been made, and in some instances, there is evidence to sustain them.\*

Such being the condition of the Irish Church as regarded the character of its clergy and the management of its revenues, the only measures adopted by Henry VIII., either of his own authority, or with the aid of his Parliament, that directly bore upon it were those connected with the suppression of the Religious Houses and the confiscation of their property; for in the parochial organization no alterations ensued. The revenues of the parishes continued without any new distribution or variation; and their incumbents and curates were neither displaced nor deprived of any rights.

Whether upon the suppression of the monasteries any arrangements could have been made to retain the services of their inmates does not appear. It is improbable that there could, since their whole system was calculated to deepen attachment to observances which Protestantism refused to continue. But, however this may have been, no attempt of the kind was made. Nothing was done to gain the monks over, or even to conciliate them; for, although in various instances pensions were given,† the motive for this was not bounty to the class, but in order to induce surrenders of certain Houses without having recourse to the use of force. In the larger number of cases no provision and no retreat or shelter was provided for the monastic persons ejected.

---

\* See Note X of Appendix.

† Grants of such pensions will be found in Morrin's *Patent Rolls*; but compare with them the great number of Religious Houses. See Note V of Appendix.



By this treatment opposition to the Reformation was with them deepened into active hostility. They—especially the Mendicant Friars, on whose continuance repressive statutes and confiscations had little effect—became the most irreconcilable enemies of the Reformed Church, and more than any other agency kept alive among the Irish portion of the people a spirit of resistance to its authority.\*

For these disadvantageous arrangements connected with the monasteries—some of them probably inevitable—compensation might have been found in a judicious application of their confiscated property. The parishes in which Appropriations existed might justly have expected that the tithes which had been thus abstracted from them would be now restored to them: the interests of the Church, indeed of society, demanded that for the work of education, heretofore conducted by the Religious Houses, schools and colleges should be founded. Neither measure was adopted. The appropriate tithes being either retained by the Crown, or granted to laymen, became mingled with the mass of public and private property, and were held to be no longer under any special obligation to contribute to ecclesiastical or charitable uses. An educational establishment, suited for either the clergy or gentry, was not provided until about ten years before Queen Elizabeth's death, when Trinity College was founded.

The policy at first pursued in reference to the Appropriations was followed by Edward and Elizabeth. Such of them as had not been granted away to laymen

---

\* See Brewer's Introduction to the third volume of the *Calendar of the Carew MSS.*, p. xiv.



before their father's death were retained for the Crown by the former; and when what he retained had been restored by Mary, Elizabeth resumed them. None of these three Sovereigns did anything whatever to improve the depressed financial condition of the Church; and unfortunately, so far from this being in any other way effected, new causes, some external and others internal, augmented during their reigns its losses. Among the former were the wars and insurrections of the natives, always attended with much waste and spoliation. Glebes and See lands were then frequently seized by the insurgent chieftains, and thus, their former boundaries being defaced, they became confused with the adjoining private estates. Among the latter causes was the power over their See lands possessed by bishops at this time, who with the consent of their Deans and Chapters, too easily procured, could lease them improvidently, or even alienate them.

Nor from the Supremacy Act to the death of Queen Elizabeth was the moral condition of the Church, if we except Dublin and its immediate neighbourhood, more improved than the financial. Outside these localities the clergy were just as secular and as negligent of their duties as they had ever been, and equally, or, since their opportunities of education had diminished, probably even more, ignorant.

There happen to remain two accounts of the condition of the Irish clergy in the reign of Elizabeth, by such high authorities, that they deserve to receive more notice than a passing reference. One is contained in a communication made to the Queen by Sir Henry Sidney, Deputy in 1566; the other will be found in

the well-known treatise of the poet Spenser, *A View of Ireland*, written in 1596.

Sidney before writing had instituted inquiries into the state of the Church. As Meath was (to use his own language) "the best inhabited country in the realm," he selected the diocese in which it was situate as the most favourable specimen, and as therefore affording a means of judging of other dioceses, "where," he said, "little or no reformation of religion or manners had yet been planted." He stated that the diocese of Meath consisted of 224 parishes, of which 157 had been appropriated in monasteries, whose possessions became vested in the Crown. Of these, 52 were served by vicars, and 105 by curates. The latter Sidney designated as "simple or sorry"; only 18 of them, he said, could speak English; while all were "of little learning or civility." They lived on the bare altarages, *i.e.* fees for services connected with the altar; they were without houses; and in many of their churches the walls were down, the chancels uncovered, and the windows and doors ruined and spoiled. The vicars were, he thought, "better served and maintained, and yet but badly." Turning from the particular details of this diocese and the inferences to be drawn from them as to the parochial system in the other dioceses, he adverted to the condition of the bishoprics, and pointed out what spoil had been committed upon their endowments, "partly by the prelates themselves, and partly by the potentates their noisome neighbours." Finally, his conclusion from the whole investigation was expressed in the emphatic words: . . . "Your Majesty may believe it, that upon the face of the earth where Christ is

professed there is not a Church in so miserable a case.”\*

Spenser spoke even more harshly than Sidney of the clergy: “Whatever disorders you see in the Church of England” (he said) “you may find in the Irish Church, and many more.” He then enumerated simony, covetousness, incontinency, sloth, and all disordered life, as existing among “the common clergymen.” Beside these they had what he calls “their particular enormities”; for which he referred to “the Irish priests,” whom he described as “in a manner mere laymen, saving that they have taken holy orders.” They followed, he added, husbandry, and neither read the Scriptures, nor preached to the people, nor administered the Communion. The benefices in the Irish country he described as “so mean, and of so small profit, through the ill husbandry of the Irish people which inhabited them, that they did not yield any competent maintenance for an honest minister to live upon, scarcely to buy him a gown.” Hence there was no attraction to Englishmen to take advantage of an Act which directed them to be preferred for ecclesiastical appointments, and such as came over were “unlearned, or men of some bad note, for which they have forsaken England.”†

It remains to consider what progress the new religious system, introduced partially and defectively by

---

\* Sidney's *Letters*, &c., vol. i. p. 112.

† *View of Ireland*, pp. 508–510. About ten years later Sir John Davis accompanied Sir Arthur Chichester to Cavan and some other northern counties. In Cavan he found the livings ill endowed, and the incumbents “such poor, ragged, ignorant creatures, we could not esteem them worthy of the meanest of those livings” (Davis's *Tracts*, p. 266).



Henry, more fully developed under Edward, and completely defined under Queen Elizabeth, made among the people. Such an inquiry, if we keep in mind the divisions from race existing among the people—unfortunately continued and further encouraged by a statute of the Parliament which enacted the Supremacy\*—cannot be conducted as a single and undivided subject of investigation. The Reformation came into Ireland upon the introduction and recommendation of the Crown,† and the relations between the native Irish and the Crown, and between the Anglo-Irish and the Crown, were wholly different. Moreover, the means by which it was brought before these two portions of the nation differed, and the influences of every kind operating on each were entirely separate and distinct.

To consider the case of the native Irish first. It cannot be said that before the death of Elizabeth (the period with which we are now concerned) they had been either subdued or reconciled to English rule. Until then they were not without hope of regaining their national independence. With sentiments and ideas of this kind Protestantism, as it was presented to them, came in direct conflict. The tenet prominently put forward was the Supremacy of the Crown in the Church. Such pre-eminence was asserted to be a part of its prerogatives, and was proclaimed by legislation, enforced by penalties, exactly in the same manner as

---

\* The Act 28 Henry VIII. c. 15 prohibited the English from following the Irish habit of wearing long hair, or hair on the upper lip, and from using (as the natives did) linen dyed with saffron. It also fixed prescribed dimensions for their shirts and smocks.

† See Note Y of Appendix.



the other parts. To admit the supremacy was, therefore, to strengthen the royal authority; it gave what was supposed to be a religious sanction to the very dominion over Ireland which the natives desired to repudiate, and against which, whenever opportunity enabled, they arrayed themselves in resistance.

Whether by judicious measures such Protestant opinions as are not connected with the supremacy might have been successfully introduced among the Irish is uncertain, since none such were tried. The course actually pursued was calculated to raise only obstacles in the way of their acceptance. The Irish clergy were treated not merely with neglect but injustice. If Englishmen could be found to take the benefices, the Irish were to be excluded.\* No effort was made even to address them with argument or persuasion. Under such circumstances, how could their conversion be expected? They had little knowledge of the Latin language, and less of the Greek or English, and until the reign of James I. there was neither an Irish New Testament nor an Irish Prayer-book; until as late as 1685 not an Irish Old Testament.† In truth, instead of disseminating among the Irish clergy, in a language which they could understand, the reasoning and instruction that had gained over English opinion, the Government then and long afterwards discouraged publications of any kind in Irish: these tended to preserve the language; and to preserve the language, it was held, would foster national sympathies and feelings.

The clergy of native Irish race, unless with rare

---

\* See 28 Henry VIII. (Irish), chap. 15, sec. 7.

† See Note Z of Appendix.

exceptions, were therefore never on the side of the Reformation. No separate action was tried with the Irish laity, and, if it had been, it would have availed nothing. Like all people of Celtic race, always remarkable for fervid attachment to their religious teachers,\* they had never initiated an independent religious movement: nor did they possess the knowledge requisite for the purpose.† They could not have proceeded by themselves, and their political separation from England precluded them from making use of English guides.

While these were the results consequent upon the introduction of the Reformation among the natives, the very causes which with persons of Irish descent impeded its acceptance operated with the Anglo-Irish to aid its progress. With them it was no objection to the supremacy that it added to the greatness of the Crown; that it strengthened the power and authority of England in Ireland. On the contrary, their interests were indissolubly bound up with the maintenance of that power and authority. On it depended their preservation in the midst of a hostile people, altogether exceeding them in number. Nor were they less influenced in the same direction by their sympathies than by their interests. They had, as there has been occasion already to remark, never abandoned the traditions of their race. They looked to the parent country as a guide, and inclined, wherever conflicting interest did not interfere, to follow its example.

---

\* Mommsen attributes to the Irish and the Gauls (both of Celtic race) that they see in the priest a father, "die kindliche Frömmigkeit, die in dem Priester den Vater sieht und ihn in allen Dingen um Rath fragt." — *History of Rome*, book v. chap. vii., near the end.

† See Note AA of Appendix.

In Dublin, therefore, and the parts of the Pale near Dublin, as the English race there predominated, the doctrinal teaching of Protestantism was relieved from the difficulties which elsewhere encompassed it. Within these limits Archbishop Browne, Bishops Staples and Miagh, and some of the clergy whose assistance they obtained, laboured even before the death of Henry VIII. to disseminate the principles of the Reformation—or rather such of them as were then accepted outside the continent. The effect of their teaching was increased by the influence of intercourse with England, which from the seat of government was necessarily constant. These efforts were followed by the more active proceedings of the next reign—the establishment of a printing press in Dublin, and the republication there of the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. The impulses thus communicated to Anglo-Irish Society were checked, but not extinguished, by the measures adopted under Queen Mary. They were easily revived, and again brought into active operation by Elizabeth, whose legislation was expressly directed to foster their growth. With this object she exercised her ecclesiastical patronage, keeping the dioceses of the Pale filled by bishops whose own sympathies were entirely in accord with her policy, and through them enforcing in the churches attended by congregations of English race the use of the English Prayer-book and the reading of an English version of the Bible. Under such influences a generation had before her death grown up. Among them the progress of Protestantism was unquestionable. On the same side are to be reckoned all the colonists who, whether in connexion with the Queen's plantations or otherwise,

settled in the country. The result at the period to which our inquiry is now directed there are not materials to determine accurately; but such information as we have leads, in my judgment, to the conclusion that then at least a majority of that portion of the Irish people which was of English race were, not only by profession, but in opinion and belief, Protestant.



## CHAPTER VII.

[1603-1625.]

JAMES THE FIRST, upon his accession to the throne of England, found in Ireland universal submission. He succeeded just when the prolonged struggle, which the native portion of the people maintained against English dominion during the reign of his predecessor, was terminated, and received a kingdom which, whatever may have been its real sentiments, professed obedience. Order had, however, not been completely established, and society still continued to exhibit the effects of the wars and disturbances through which for forty years before Queen Elizabeth's death it had passed.

In the last chapter there has been occasion to note the injudicious policy by which the Anglo-Irish had been kept distinct from the native Irish, so that the people became separated into two distinct divisions with differing interests, opinions, and sentiments. James, educated and until he succeeded to the Crown of England resident in Scotland, from the first proposed to himself a new system of government. All who lived in Ireland, natives as well as colonists, he professed to regard as subjects who, if obedient, deserved his paternal care.

Distinctions of laws and customs in different provinces or districts were to be abolished; and as well the whole system of jurisprudence, as the constitution of society, was to be assimilated to what was established in England.

In order to accomplish these ends, the first matter entered upon was to extend everywhere the administration of justice in the English manner. The new counties, formed during Elizabeth's reign, facilitated this measure. Whatever was then left incomplete for the purpose of dividing the entire island into counties was now perfected; when this was done the circuits of the judges were gradually so arranged as to bring all parts of the country within reach of assizes held under commissions from the Crown.

The next step taken was to induce as many as possible of the Irish chieftains to surrender their existing titles, and accept grants from the King. On such occasions they were obliged to make new arrangements with those who held under them, and rents payable in money were required to be substituted for the services and duties that had been until then rendered.\*

While these proceedings were in progress, either secret information, or some occurrences in Ulster, led the Irish Government to apprehend a renewal of disturbances, and to take precautions against it. Tyrone, who, although, as has been before mentioned, his rebellion was entirely subdued, had as yet not been interfered with, and Tyrconnell, another of the northern chieftains—either because they intended insurrection,

---

\* See Sir John Davis's *Discovery*, &c., pp. 57, 58.

or because, if innocent, they feared that in the event of an outbreak they would be treated as guilty—decided to consult for their own safety, and fled to the Continent. A short time afterwards, one of their allies, O'Dogherty, a native chieftain, proclaimed war, and, being at first unchecked, seized and burned the town of Derry. Tyrone and Tyrconnell were at once treated as outlaws; O'Dogherty met his death from an accidental shot. Thereupon, the territories not only of these three Chieftains, but also of their followers, were held to be confiscated to the Crown. Thus immense tracts of land, comprehending the entire, or nearly the entire, of the counties of Donegal, Tyrone, Derry, Fermanagh, Cavan, and Armagh, came into the power and were at the disposal of the King.

James, notwithstanding the policy which he had laid down to guide his general conduct towards the natives, entertained upon the question of colonization precisely the same ideas as his predecessors, Elizabeth and Mary. So also did his ablest ministers.\* He, therefore, determined to plant the lands now subject to his control with English and Scotch settlers. As former proceedings for a similar purpose had been attended with little success, the causes of their failure were investigated, and the plan for the present occasion framed with provisions designed to obviate them. In devising it the King was aided by the great abilities of Bacon, at that time his Attorney-General in England, and by the experience in Irish affairs of Sir Arthur Chichester, then the Lord Deputy.

---

\* See, for instance, Lord Bacon's Tract, entitled, *Considerations touching the Plantation in Ireland*, and Sir John Davis's *Discovery*, &c., p. 58.



The scheme of plantation ultimately approved was upon a most extensive scale; the importation of settlers being intended to be numerous enough to ensure that they, and not the natives, should preponderate in influence over the planted counties. Lest the colonists might be induced to abandon their previous habits, and in order to prevent such assimilation on their part with the Irish as might weaken their obedience to the English Government, they were to be encouraged to live together in villages. No single proprietor was to have more than two thousand acres. Those who had this amount were to constitute one class. A second class might receive fifteen hundred acres, and a third one thousand. The first class were to build a castle and a fortified courtyard (called a bawn); the second a house and bawn; from the third a bawn only was required. The lands allotted to each class were to be planted with farmers, cottagers, and artificers, according to prescribed rules. Large estates were to be assigned to the Companies of the Corporation of London.\* Lands which had belonged to the Church were to be restored to it; and, in addition, portions of the estates forfeited by laymen were to be granted as glebes for parochial clergymen. In each county certain distinct and defined districts were to be reserved for the dispossessed natives.†

---

\* When the lands were distributed, Trinity College also received a portion.

† Sir John Davis, however, says that "the King made a mixed plantation of British and Irish, that they might grow up together in one nation: only the Irish were in some places transplanted from the woods and mountains into the plains and open countries, that being removed (like wild fruit-trees) they might grow the milder and bear the better and sweeter fruit.—*Discovery*, &c., p. 58.



These regulations, admirably calculated to promote the objects of those who prepared them, were—with some variations—carried out. The result was, that a large number of English and Scotch emigrated from their own countries, and came and settled in the six forfeited counties. Of these, the Scotch formed a majority: and as two other Ulster counties, Down and Antrim, were also peopled from Scotland, they ultimately gained a decided predominance of power and influence in the northern districts of the island.

The introduction of so many Scotch colonists added another to the races of which the Irish people were composed. From this time they must be classified in three divisions, each marked by its own peculiar characteristics. The distribution of these in the occupation of the soil, after the plantation had been completed, was much as follows:—The principal part of the English dwelt in Dublin, the Pale, the Ulster settlements, and towns in other parts of the country outside the Pale, especially the seaports; the Scotch were altogether in Ulster: the Irish everywhere else, numbers of them being also in the Pale and Ulster.

When the Plantation no longer required the King's attention, he resumed the policy favourable to the interest of the natives which he had at first adopted: and, partly in order to develop it, partly with the object of obtaining a confirmation of the attainder of the Ulster chieftains and of the confiscation of their territories, a Parliament was summoned. To give weight to its enactments, to exhibit the impartial rule of the Sovereign, and in the hope of conciliating at least some of the discontented tribes, it was determined to extend the

representation of the people in the House of Commons. The right to vote for its members, and the right to sit, if elected, were to be irrespective of any distinction of race or religion. It was also determined that not only should the entire number of counties (now for the first time) be represented, but that a number of new boroughs should be created. In selecting these, however, regard was had to the supposed tendencies of their inhabitants in favour of the English interest; and it was owing to this circumstance that most of the new towns which had been commenced by the settlers in Ulster—as yet indeed for the most part mere villages—were among them.

The Parliament thus summoned met in the month of May, 1613. The House of Lords consisted of bishops and temporal peers, the latter about twenty-five in number: the members returned to the House of Commons amounted to two hundred and thirty-two, of whom two hundred and twenty-six attended. These were found to be divided into two parties—one on the side of the King's government, and ready to support their measures; the other adverse to them: the former English and Scotch, in religion Protestant, numbering one hundred and twenty-five; the latter composed of the other members, partly Irish, partly English by descent, all opposed to the Reformation, and, from refusing to conform to the religion of the State, then termed Recusants.\*

A contest for the office of Speaker, for which each of the two parties put forward a different candidate, finally ended in the appointment of Sir John Davis,

---

\* See as to this Parliament Leland, who refers to a MS. in the Lambeth Library.—*History of Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 447.

James's Irish Attorney-General, and one of the most eminent persons of the age. To this circumstance we are indebted for the most complete account extant of the differences between the constitution of this Parliament and that of its predecessors, Davis having taken the opportunity of an address to Sir Arthur Chichester, when he as Deputy ratified his appointment, to enter at some length upon the subject.\* In this he pointed out that former Parliaments were summoned on special occasions, and for limited purposes; that the House of Commons came at first from a small number of shires, and even when the counties were increased, not from the remote shires of Ulster: whereas, the present Parliament was (he observed) called not to repel a rebellion, or to reduce degenerate subjects to their obedience, but, as God had blessed the whole island with an universal peace and obedience together with plenty, civility, and other felicities, principally in order then to confirm and establish these blessings, and to make them perpetual unto posterity. The time at which it was convened was (he said) when the kingdom, wholly reduced into shire-ground, contained thirty-three† counties at large; when

---

\* Sir John Davis's address is printed in the Appendix to the second volume of Leland's *History*. Davis was sent to Ireland by James; but he had in the previous reign acquired distinction in England, especially by a philosophical poem, entitled *Nosce Teipsum*, of great merit, but scarcely deserving Hallam's judgment that "perhaps no language can produce a poem extending to so great a length, of more condensation of thought, or in which fewer languid verses will be found." His reputation now rests on the historical treatise in relation to Ireland which has been referred to in previous notes to this chapter. Charles I., in 1626, appointed him Chief Justice of England, but he died suddenly before he could enter on the office.

† Tipperary in this Parliament had only two members; but previously



all Ulster and Connaught, as well as Leinster and Munster, had voices in Parliament by their knights and burgesses; when all the inhabitants, English of birth, English of blood, the new British colony, and the old Irish natives, did all meet together to make laws for the common good of themselves and their posterity.

In conformity with the King's general policy, and with the objects which were thus set before the House of Commons by their Speaker, an Act was obtained from this Parliament which repealed all the statutes then in force that tended to keep separate the people of English and the people of Irish race. Its recitals were even more important than its enacting provisions. They declared that "the cause of the former laws did now cease; in that all the natives and inhabitants of the kingdom, without difference and distinction, were taken into his Majesty's gracious protection; and that there were no better means to settle peace than to allow them to commerce and match together, that so they might grow into one nation, and former differences be forgotten."\*

Along with this Parliament—and as part of the policy of assimilating Ireland to England—a Convocation of the clergy was, for the first time in Ireland, summoned. It met on the 24th of May, 1613. It was formed by an union of the Provincial Synods. When they met the whole was modelled after the Convocation of Canterbury, and accordingly there were two

---

for parliamentary purposes it generally had been divided into two counties. Unless Tipperary be treated as being thus divided, the number of counties was then, as now, thirty-two.

\* Act 13 James I., ch. 5.



Houses, sitting separately—an Upper House, composed of bishops; and a Lower House, composed of certain dignitaries *ex-officio*, and of two representatives, called proctors, elected by the clergy of each diocese. Jones, Archbishop of Dublin, and then also Lord Chancellor, presided in the Upper House, and Barlow, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, was prolocutor of the Lower House.\* Although so few years had elapsed of James's reign, almost all the bishops of this date owed their appointments to him. Those whom he selected were by birth either English or Scotch.† Parliament and Convocation were not dissolved until 1615, there being in the interval adjournments and prorogations of both. Convocation assumed the same power of taxing the clergy which was enjoyed by the English Convocations, and not long before it ceased to sit voted the King a subsidy.

At this time the Articles of Faith subscribed by the Irish clergy were the Articles of 1566, eleven in number, which in the previous reign had been published by authority in Dublin.‡ Their brevity and also their imperfection in other respects had been for some time complained

---

\* Both Jones and Barlow were from Cambridge. Jones held the office of Lord Chancellor, from his appointment to the Archbishopric until his death in 1619. Barlow was recommended for the Archbishopric of Tuam to Charles I. by Ussher, in 1629 (Cotton's *Fasti*, iv. 14). He was probably, therefore, of theological opinions similar to those held by Ussher. Some writers date the meeting of this Convocation in 1615; but Bishop Reeves, in the paper already referred to at page 22, *supra*, shows it met in 1613, nearly coincidently with the Parliament.

† See, as to the bishops at the date of the Convocation of 1613, and for the successive appointments from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to that date, Note BB of Appendix.

‡ See page 77, *supra*.

of, and accordingly the propriety of substituting other Articles of a more elaborate and extended character was one of the matters which first engaged the attention of Convocation. The requisite licence from the Crown to enable the subject to become a matter of deliberation, and to permit subsequent legislation to remedy defects, was accordingly procured.\*

In the English Church the Thirty-nine Articles, enacted for subscription by the clergy in 1570,† were at this time in use. As—at least since the Supremacy Act—the Church of Ireland had followed in the footsteps of the Church of England, it was to have been expected that the Irish Convocation would now at once adopt and require for subscription by the clergy these Articles. But it was decided otherwise; and accordingly distinct Articles which, while making use of the Thirty-nine Articles, and of other standards of faith, should as a whole be an original composition, were directed to be prepared. That a principal motive actuating Convocation in this course was a desire to act independently; to show that the Reformed Irish Church had itself considered the doctrines respecting which it pronounced judgment, and had arrived in respect of them at its own conclusions, is certain; but there is reason also to think that with this was united a desire to speak upon

---

\* This licence, or writ, Archbishop King informed Swift in 1711, and Archbishop Wake in 1717, that he had seen (see Bishop Reeves' paper on "Convocation" already cited). Although the "Act of Submission" (see page 14, *supra*), was never passed in Ireland, the common law which it was supposed to declare was operative there, and therefore the Irish Convocation, like the English, could not, it was thought, legislate without licence from the Crown.

† See page 99, *supra*.

the questions of predestination and election in different language from that employed by the English Articles in reference to these subjects, framed as the English had been so as to admit of considerable latitude of interpretation, and of their being, therefore, assented to by persons of varying opinions.

These views more particularly prevailed in the Lower House, where circumstances gave a preponderance to what was afterwards termed "doctrinal Puritanism"—a religious system which, in reference to predestination, if it did not adopt the opinions usually associated with the teaching of Calvin precisely in his own words, certainly differed from them only by some mitigation in the form of expression. The circumstances which had this effect were, in the first place, the position of Protestantism in Ireland engaging it in constant conflict with the Roman Catholic creed, and as a result drawing it farther and farther from the tenets of its antagonist; and, in the second place, the influence which the new College, where Puritanism had been introduced by its first Provosts, began to exercise over the clergy.\*

The ideas upon the question of predestination held by the Irish Convocation were soon manifested; for

---

\* The first Provost was Archbishop Loftus, who was so decidedly of the Puritan party, that he recommended for an Irish bishopric Cartwright, its most eminent champion in England (Shirley's *Letters*, &c., p. 321). The second was Travers, who had been Hooker's antagonist on the questions in controversy with the Puritans, and of whom Walton relates, that it was said, when Hooker preached *Canterbury* at the Temple Church in the morning, Travers preached *Geneva* at the same place in the afternoon. Alvey was the third, who was also a Puritan. (See Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, pp. 15, 16.) Sir Arthur Chichester, also, the Deputy at this time, is said to have belonged to the Puritan party.



when the new Articles came to be framed, instead of adopting the propositions laid down in relation to the subject by the Seventeenth of the English Articles, recourse was had to "the Lambeth Articles"—a composition which had been drawn up to please the Puritan party by some English divines about eight years before Queen Elizabeth's death, and which, although accepted by Archbishop Whitgift, she, with the concurrence of Burleigh, had rejected.

The Lambeth Articles deviated from the English Seventeenth Article by adding to what was contained in the latter a distinct affirmance of the doctrine of reprobation. Their first and third Articles say, "that God from eternity has predestinated some unto life, and has reprobated some unto death: that of the predestinated there is a predetermined and fixed number which can neither be increased nor diminished."\*

The composition of the Irish Articles† is attributed to James Ussher, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, than whom no one had in that age, either in England or Ireland, a higher reputation for ecclesiastical learning. He then held the office of Professor of Divinity in Trinity College. His theological tenets at this time were known to be, with probably some modification, those of the Calvinistic school of divinity.

Whether the Articles as they were ultimately approved differed in any respect from Ussher's original

---

\* i. Deus ab eterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit. iii. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest. I cite from Hardwick on *The Thirty-nine Articles*, App., p. 344.

† See Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, vol. i. p. 147.



draft does not appear. When completed they were one hundred and four in number. Their most important difference from the Thirty-nine Articles was with respect to the predestinarian question. They on this subject follow the Lambeth Articles, whose propositions as to reprobation they adopt. To them is, however, appended a clause apparently intended to mitigate the severity of their language. It is expressed in the following terms:—  
“All things being ordained for the manifestation of his (*i.e.* God’s) glory, and his glory being to appear both in the works of his mercy and of his justice, it seemed good to his heavenly wisdom to choose out a certain number towards whom he would extend his undeserved mercy, leaving the rest to be spectacles of his justice.”\*

The Articles relating to the Sacraments were derived from the English, but with alterations which deserve notice. For the passage in the Twenty-seventh English Article (of baptism), beginning “but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth,” &c., was substituted “but much more a sacrament of our admission into the Church, sealing unto us our new-birth (and consequently our justification, adoption, and sanctification) by the communion which we have with Jesus Christ.” In the Twenty-eighth Article (of the Lord’s Supper), between the paragraph condemning the doctrine of transubstantiation and the declaration with respect to the reception of our Lord’s body, was introduced the following paragraph: . . . “In the outward part of the Holy

---

\* This clause has received less attention from those who have commented upon the Irish Articles than it seems to me to deserve. See further observations connected with it in Note CC of Appendix.

Communion the Bodie and Blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented: being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signified and sealed are present with the signes and seales, that is to say, symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spirituall part the same bodie and blood is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Sonne of God, even to all those that beleieve in his name. And unto such as in this manner doe worthyly and with faith repair unto the Lord's Table, the bodie and blood of Christ is not only signified and offered, but also truly exhibited and communicated."

Such other variations from the Thirty-nine Articles as the Irish Articles exhibit were very much owing to the greater number of subjects entered upon. Among these were some more usually dealt with in homilies, such as our duty to God, and our duty to our neighbour; and some which involve questions that other Churches have judged it wiser not to discuss—such as the primeval state of man, the fall of angels, and the place of departed spirits after death.\* It deserves to be noted that as regards the observance of Sunday, the Articles laid down teaching directly contrary to the directions issued in England by James, who enjoined that in the intervals between the services in church the people should indulge in the sports and games which he then enumerated. The Fifty-sixth Article expressly declared, that "the first day of the week, which is the Lord's Day, is wholly to be dedicated unto the service of God: and that therefore we are bound therein to

---

\* See observations upon the Irish Articles in Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 44.

rest from our common and daily businesse, and to bestow that leasure upon holy exercises, both publike and private.”

From this circumstance, as well as from the general tendency of the Articles, it clearly appears that Convocation proceeded spontaneously, without the slightest dictation on the part of the Crown: and as it has never been suggested that the assembly was not duly summoned, its standard of doctrine may be taken fairly to represent what was generally approved by such portion of the Irish clergy as were really in communion with the Reformed Church. That the Articles as enacted were permitted by the King has excited surprise. Probably at a later period they would not have been accepted by him, for afterwards his ecclesiastical policy became openly and decidedly opposed to the theology which they represented; and he altogether discouraged doctrines contained in them, and was actively hostile to Puritans and Puritanism.\*

The Articles, when completed by Convocation, were signed by the President of the Upper House, and by the Prolocutor of the Lower; and were then ratified by the Lord Deputy, pursuant, it is said, to the direction of the King.† They were not submitted to Parliament; for

---

\* In 1620 Emanuel Downing, in a letter to Ussher, speaks of Puritanism being odious to James. (See Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 50.)

† The official title of the Articles was—"Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Clergie of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin, in the yeare of our Lord God 1615, for the avoiding of diversities of opinion, and the establishing of consent touching true religion."

The Articles are printed at length in the Appendix to Elrington's *Life of Ussher*; in the Appendix to Hardwick on the *Thirty-nine Articles*;



what reason has not been explained, and as the King is said to have authorised their affirmance by the Deputy, it is now impossible to conjecture.

Although James's political ideas in various respects favoured the native Irish, yet, so far as religion, they were treated with less toleration than in Elizabeth's time. Beside proclamations both at the commencement and near the end of this reign against seminary and other priests remaining in the country, attendance on the services at church was, in 1605, ordered "on pain of his Majesty's high displeasure, and of such further punishments as might be lawfully inflicted upon the wilful contemners of his royal commands and prerogatives." Nor did the matter rest in words and menaces; fines were imposed for disobedience of this order, and also for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy.\*

It is probable that in these proclamations and penalties the King was animated more by a desire to maintain his prerogative than by any consideration of a particular form of religion, or zeal to uphold it. He did not, however, neglect Irish ecclesiastical affairs. Beside the grants which he made for the benefit of the Church out of the Ulster forfeited lands, restitution was compelled of property which had been forcibly taken from it; and in various instances where, by errors in previous patents, ecclesiastical estates were conveyed to laymen, a composition was obtained, it being intimated

---

and also in the Appendix to the first volume of Dr. Killen's *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*. It is therefore not thought necessary to repeat them in the Appendix to the present treatise.

\* The proclamations and instances of the proceedings to enforce them are cited by Dr. Killen from the *State Papers*.—*Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. pp. 475-80.



that unless this were conceded the patents would be vitiated, on the ground that the Sovereigns who issued them had been deceived in their grants.\* Moreover, the condition of the Church was inquired into by Commissions† and otherwise, and exertions were used to improve the discipline of the clergy, but (as will appear from investigations made in the next reign) with little beneficial effect.

In addition to the vacancies in the bishoprics which, as has been mentioned, were before the Convocation of 1613 filled with English and Scotch ecclesiastics, others occurred, in which the same system of appointing persons, English or Scotch by birth, was continued. James Ussher, who was Irish by birth and education, formed an exception. He was promoted first to Meath, in 1621, and thence to Armagh, in 1625, a few days before the King's death.

Ussher's predecessor in Armagh, Hampton, was also appointed by James. He was much esteemed, his learning being especially noted. His See owed to him a palace and demesne. Some time before he came to Ireland he had been sent by James on a mission to the Scotch, in the hope that his arguments might aid in reconciling

---

\* Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, vol. i. p. 35.

† The Reports as to the state of the dioceses of the Province of Armagh (except Dromore), given by their bishops in 1622, to a Commission issued by James, are preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin; that for Dromore is in the library at Armagh founded by Primate Robinson. Mant summarises them in his *History*, vol. i. pp. 395-407. The number and evil effects of the impropriations clearly appear. Thus, in Armagh, while there were 46 rectories, there were 13 vicarages, and 33 impropriate curacies, the last having only small allowances from the lay rectors.

them to episcopacy and to the ecclesiastical policy proposed for their Church ; and he had then preached a sermon on these subjects before the Assembly at Glasgow, which added to his previous reputation.\* On one point—toleration and charity towards those who differed from him—he seems to have been in advance of his contemporaries. There has been preserved a letter of his to Ussher, occasioned by a sermon of the latter, which gave offence from language alleged to have been “harsh and sharp,” and which was supposed to have recommended a more rigid execution of the laws against Recusants. In this letter Hampton counsels a milder interpretation of “the points offensive,” and in reference to an expression which it was charged had been uttered in favour of drawing the sword, uses the remarkable words, “of this spirit we are not nor ought to be.”†

James’s theological opinions varied at different periods of his reign. He was always strenuous for episcopacy, repeating as an undoubted maxim in statecraft, “no bishop, no king”; but when he first came to England this did not hinder his being content with Calvinistic Divines, some of whom he accordingly sent to the Synod of Dort to represent the English Church. After that assembly had been held, he observed that the party which began then to be called Arminian, from its leader upon the Continent, and which was in direct opposition to Calvinism, was very zealous for the royal authority and prerogative, and he proceeded to give his confidence and support to them. When he appointed Ussher to

---

\* A copy of this Sermon is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

† The letter is printed in Ussher’s works, vol. xv. p. 183. It is dated 17th October, 1622.

Meath, James was understood to incline to this party ; nevertheless, the high reputation of that eminent man, and personal esteem for him, entirely outweighed the objections which Ussher's doctrinal views might otherwise have caused.

Before James turned towards Arminianism, he collated to the See of Derry George Downham, or Downam, whose theological opinions in many respects resembled those held by Ussher. This divine had obtained high distinction at Cambridge, where he held the Professorship of Logic. He had also, with ability, taken part in the controversy respecting episcopacy,\* which was commenced by the Puritans in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and had from that time continued. The views which Downham advocated in reference to the office of bishop deserve attention. He holds it to be of apostolical institution, and that this is the opinion to which ascertained facts conduct—(1) because episcopal government was generally used in all Christian Churches for three hundred years after Christ and his Apostles, and there is no decree of any General Council to account for its adoption during that period ; (2) because it was in use in apostolic times, and was not contradicted by the Apostles ; (3) because in some instances the Apostles ordained bishops. In connexion with the apostolical origin of the institution, he refers to a distinction taken by some which he seems inclined to approve between things which are *divini juris*, and those which are *apos-*

---

\* See "Sermon defining the honourable function of bishops, preached 17th April, A.D. 1608, at the consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, by George Downham, D.D." Printed at London, A.D. 1608.



*tolici juris* : the former being generally, perpetually, and immutably necessary; the latter not so. With respect to the position of presbyters in reference to the ordination of the clergy, he holds that the right to ordain ministers is in bishops, yet he will not so appropriate it to them as that extraordinarily and in case of necessity it might not be lawful for presbyters to ordain.\*

The policy of the King in extending English rule and law to the Irish districts was expected quickly to accomplish the improvement of the natives. It was followed by some satisfactory results, but by no means to the degree that was anticipated. In truth, the change was too abrupt and too complete. Reform, to succeed, must accompany, not outrun, the growth of society. Many Irish reluctantly exchanged the freedom of their old independence for the restraints of civilization.

---

\* Before Downham's sermon the case for episcopacy had been rested both upon lower and higher grounds than he takes. Whitgift in 1573, answering Cartwright on the Puritan side, relied upon the fact that the Church had determined to be governed by bishops: whereas Saravia, in 1590, argued that episcopacy came immediately from God, and that men could not of their own will alter it (see Keble's Preface to his edition of *Hooker's Works*, pp. lxiii., lxvi.). Episcopacy was also defended because selected by the State (see Perry's *History*, ii. 342). Lord Bacon (and he probably represented the ideas of the laity), about the time of Downham's sermon, wrote . . . "that there should be but one form of discipline in all Churches, and that imposed by necessity of a commandment and prescript out of the Word of God: it is a matter volumes have been compiled of, and therefore cannot receive a brief dismissal. I, for my part, do confess, that in revolving the Scriptures, I could never find any such thing; but that God had left the like liberty to the Church government as he had done to the civil government; to be varied according to time, and place, and accidents, which nevertheless his high and divine providence doth order and dispose."—Bacon's *Tract On Pacification of the Church*, addressed to James I.



The effect, however, of his other great measure, the Ulster Plantation, upon both the civil and ecclesiastical interests of the country, was extensive. The northern counties were transformed into a high state of cultivation, covered with towns, villages, and the comfortable residences of opulent proprietors and farmers. The Established Church gained increased endowment, especially from grants of glebes to the parishes. The number of her members was augmented by the new English colonists. But, on the other hand, the Scotch settlers brought with them the dislike to episcopacy which animated their own countrymen; and persevering in their opposition to it, they ultimately founded a distinct Church upon their own principles. Henceforward the Irish religious system, representing the differing opinions of the three races of which the people were composed, becomes separated into three divisions—Roman Catholic, Protestant with episcopacy, and Protestant without episcopacy.

## CHAPTER VIII.

[1625-1660.]

WHEN Charles the First came to the throne he found England divided by angry dissensions relating to the government and discipline of the Church. These had commenced early in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. They originated with the exiles who, having resided upon the Continent during the persecution of the Reformers by Mary, returned after her death, bringing with them ideas in relation to these subjects more in consonance with the organization of foreign Protestant Churches, than with the ecclesiastical system which was being established in England. At first the questions raised were not of importance. Some ceremonies and procedure sanctioned by the Prayer-book were objected to; the apathy of the clergy was commented upon; and abuses in the administration of affairs within the Church were pointed out. From these topics the discontented went on adding to and increasing their grounds of censure, until at last many repudiated episcopacy altogether; and a considerable number formed separate and independent sects. The progress of the dissentient party was met (reaction being proportioned to the action which causes it) by

corresponding resistance. The defenders of the Church kept pace with its adversaries; and the claims put forward on its behalf gradually became higher and more exclusive. At first it was thought enough to prove that the ceremonies and matters of like kind which were condemned were things indifferent; that the State had much authority in such cases, and that certainly the Church could make its own ordinances as to non-essentials: it was even admitted that there were imperfections, and the difficulty of removing what had grown up with so much that was good was pleaded. Afterwards no concession would be allowed; everything that had been done or established was right, and was alone right.\*

In this position controversy upon these subjects stood at the close of Elizabeth's reign. During the rule of James it was continued. Distinct parties, founded on differences of religious opinions, were at that time formed among the English people, and lasted until the King's death. Then it was found that of these parties that which complained of the existing ecclesiastical system—known by the appellation (either as a term of reproach, or by their own choice) of Puritans—received most support from the laity; while with the clerical body the ideas generally in favour were those which attributed high and exclusive authority to episcopacy,

---

\* This is the account given by Bacon in his Tract entitled, *An Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England*, written while Elizabeth was living. He observes of the opposing Church parties: "The beginnings were modest, but the extremes are violent; so as there is almost as great a distance now of either side from itself as was at first from the other." (See the Tract in Spedding's *Life and Letters of Bacon*, vol. i. p. 73.)

and prescribed implicit conformity to the ritual and practice of the Establishment.

Concurrently with religious differences arose political. Elizabeth and James both (but especially the latter) asserted for the Crown almost arbitrary power. Such claims, inconsistent with the constantly increasing progress and development of society, provoked resistance. The discontent because of them at last became extensive. Seeking whatever aid it could procure for a necessarily arduous contest, it allied itself with the discontent excited in connexion with ecclesiastical affairs. A movement began which was directed against the Crown and the Episcopate, and against the ascendancy which, it was charged, they both demanded.

With such difficulties Charles I. had neither wisdom nor statesmanship adequate to cope. His reign was passed either in conflict with Parliament, or in attempts to govern without a Parliament. How out of these relations grew the great civil war between the King and the House of Commons; how this war ultimately terminated in the abolition of the Monarchy and of the Established Church in England, are part of the general history of the country known to all, and, therefore, not requiring to be repeated here.

From the accession of Charles I. to his death, the course of affairs both in Church and State in Ireland was necessarily influenced by contemporary events in England. Whatever happened there to weaken the stability of the Monarchy and Established Church, tended also to weaken the stability of the Monarchy and Established Church in Ireland. No one supposed that institutions of their nature could survive in the



latter kingdom, if they had perished in the former. Nevertheless, during all this reign Ireland has a distinctive history of its own, with totally different incidents from those occurring in England, which, so far as it related to or affected ecclesiastical affairs, will now demand consideration.

The particular troubles which surrounded the Church of England when Charles succeeded to the Crown, had not then extended to the Church of Ireland. What troubles he met there (and they were numerous) were of a different character. They arose from mismanagement of ecclesiastical property, and from relaxation of discipline. Except in Ulster, where lands were acquired in the Plantation, the financial condition of the Church continued to be very much what we have seen it was at the close of Elizabeth's reign; for, although many impropriations that had remained vested in the Crown were restored to the parishes by King James, against this gain must be set considerable loss of Church lands occasioned by improvident grants and leases, and in many instances also from the forcible intrusion of laymen. The discipline of the clergy, too, had not attained a higher standard than it reached under the Queen; few of them were as yet educated in Trinity College; and they were generally without learning, secular in habits, negligent of their duties, and neither revered nor deserving of reverence.

In 1631 the King's attention being directed by complaints from Ireland to the want of discipline in the Irish Church, he addressed to the four Irish archbishops, and through them to the bishops and clergy, a letter which pointed out, among other matters which

were observed upon, the necessity of the clergy being diligent in the discharge of their duties; that they should preach and catechise in the parishes committed to their care, and "live answerable to the doctrine which they preached to the people."\*

About two years later Charles selected for the government of Ireland the most able of the statesmen on whose advice he relied—Wentworth, whom he at a later date created Earl of Strafford, the title by which that great Minister is now best known, and by which it will therefore be most convenient to designate him. It is not improbable that among the considerations moving the King to this choice, was his desire to provide some remedy for the condition of the Irish Church; and it seems to have been for a like reason, and with a view to the conduct of measures of reform, that Bramhall, a beneficed clergyman in the English Church, whose capacity for affairs had attracted notice, was asked, and in the end induced, to resign his preferments in England, and become Strafford's chaplain. Certainly, both Strafford and Bramhall proceeded, immediately upon their arrival in Ireland, as if the improvement of the Church was the chief, or one of the chief, duties with which the former had been charged.

The first step taken by Strafford to carry out the policy in relation to ecclesiastical affairs on which he and Bramhall had determined, was to have a Visitation held under the authority of the Crown. What then appeared, and what was ascertained by other investigations, con-

---

\* Cited by Mant from Parr's *Life of Ussher*, p. 38.

firmed the complaints which previously reached England.\* Much ecclesiastical property had been abstracted from the Church. To procure its restitution, Strafford used the almost despotic power of the Irish Government. Thus, the Earl of Cork was forced to surrender tithes worth about two thousand pounds a-year, of which he had become possessed. Many also of the improper alienations were purchased back by money raised by Bramhall from subscriptions for the purpose in England, aided by loans upon the security of the property to be regained. The King also restored many impropriations according as the leases of them made by his predecessors expired.†

Exertions to serve the pecuniary interests of the Church were accompanied by exertions to improve its discipline. Strafford observing the habitual non-residence of the clergy in their parishes, and the vain

---

\* A correspondence between Laud on the one hand, and Strafford and Bramhall on the other, has been published, which discloses the opinions of the latter as to the Irish Church—"An unlearned clergy" (says Strafford), "which have not so much as the outward form of churchmen to cover themselves with, nor their persons anyways revered or protected: the churches unbuilt; the parsonage and vicarage houses utterly ruined; the people untaught through the non-residency of the clergy . . . the possessions of the Church to a great proportion in lay hands; the bishops aliening their very principal houses and demesnes to their children, to strangers." (Letter, 31st Jan., 1634; Strafford's *Letters*, vol. i. pp. 186, 187; and see also, to the same effect, a letter of Bedell to Laud, 1st April, 1630, cited in Burnet's *Life of Bedell*.) Vesey in his *Life of Bramhall* says that there was not one bishopric in the province of Cashel "that had not the marks of the sacrilegious paw upon it."

† The grants of impropriate tithes by James I. and Charles I. to the Irish Church will be found abstracted in the Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into its revenues, &c., A.D. 1868. (See Paper No. 29 of its Appendix.)



expense in which (he said) they indulged in the towns where they were resident—"to the great disservice of their cures and the great scandal of the Church"—required that the bishops should compel them "to repair to their churches and attend that charge whereof they owed an account both to God and man."\*

The object, however, sought with most anxiety by Strafford and Bramhall was to terminate the difference between the Churches of England and Ireland in respect of the Articles which formed the standards of doctrine in each,† and to effect an absolute uniformity between them. It is said that this measure was desired by the King, and was one of the matters which he gave into the charge of Strafford, when he sent him to Ireland.‡ Nor was this wholly for reasons of a theological character: it was thought that agreement between the two kingdoms in ecclesiastical affairs would promote harmony also in political.

Accordingly, when Convocation met in 1634, occa-

\* Strafford's *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 7. Leland, who is not in general favourable to Strafford, says that under him "abler and more respectable teachers were generally provided."—Vol. iii. p. 40.

† See pages 110–115, *supra*.

‡ Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, vol. i. p. 149. The Irish Articles displeased the High Church party in England which the King favoured. Their estimate of them, it may be assumed, is represented in the language used by Jeremy Taylor when preaching at Bramhall's funeral, in Dublin. In his sermon on that occasion, after alluding to Bramhall having caused the English Articles to be accepted, he says, "that they and we might be *populus unius labii*, of one heart and one life, building up our hopes of heaven on a most holy faith, and taking away that Shibboleth which made this Church (*i.e.* the Irish) lisp too undevoutly, or rather in some little degree to speak the speech of Ashdod, and not the language of Canaan."



sion was taken to propose that the English Thirty-nine Articles should be adopted in Ireland. The subject was first brought forward in the Upper House by Bramhall, who had shortly before been appointed Bishop of Derry. Nothing was there said as to the Irish Articles of 1615 being either condemned or approved. Bramhall's observations were directed to urge the expediency of having "the correspondence between the Churches of England and Ireland more entire and accurate." He also pointed out "the convenience of having the Articles of peace and communion in every national Church worded in such latitude, that dissenting persons in those things that concerned not the Christian faith might subscribe, and the Church not lose the benefit of their labours for an opinion which, it might be, they could not help."\*

In this Convocation Ussher was President of the Upper House—a question of precedence, previously in dispute between the Sees of Armagh and Dublin, having been decided in favour of the former by Strafford a short time before. Lesley, Dean of Down, was Prolocutor of the Lower House. The Upper House readily voted for adopting the Thirty-nine Articles.† In the Lower House there was opposition, and the difficulties raised were overcome only by the interference of Strafford, who insisted that the English Articles as they

---

\* Cited by Mant (vol. i. p. 489) from Vesey's *Life of Bramhall*.

† There were at this time four archbishops and nineteen suffragan bishops, of whom only Ussher and Martin Bishop of Meath were educated in Trinity College, Dublin; the rest were English or Scotch. Bramhall says he did not remember any except two who spoke in favour of the Irish Articles: "If there were any, they were very few, and did it faintly."—*Works*, Anglo-Cath. Lib., v. 81.

stood should be voted for affirmatively or negatively, without amendment or alteration, and without any accompanying expression of approval of the Irish Articles. He himself drew up the form which was to express the resolution he desired from Convocation, and it was his draft which, being adopted by them, became the First Canon.\* It was expressed in the following words:—

“ . . . For the manifestation of our agreement with the Church of England in the confession of the same Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments, we do receive and approve the Book of Articles of religion, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops, and the whole clergy in the Convocation at London, in the year of our Lord 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion. And, therefore, if any hereafter shall affirm that any of those Articles are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated, and not absolved before he make a public recantation of his error.”

---

\* Strafford, when sending his draft of the Canon, conveyed his wishes to Convocation in a communication marked by that despotic imperiousness which marred his great qualities, and was one cause of the enmity which pursued him to his end. . . . “Mr. Prolocutor—I send you here enclosed the form of a Canon to be passed by the votes of this Lower House of Convocation, which I require you to put to the question for their consents, without admitting any debates or other discourse: for I hold it not fit, nor will suffer, that the Articles of the Church of England be disputed. Therefore I expect you to take only the voices consenting or dissenting, and to give me a particular account how each man gives his vote. The time admits of no delay, so I further require you to perform the contents of this letter forthwith; and so I rest, your good friend, WENTWORTH.” This letter, not printed in Strafford’s *Letters*, will be found among Laud’s *Letters*, Anglo-Cath. Theol., vii. 98.

Strafford succeeded in preventing any declaration by Convocation in affirmance of the Irish Articles of 1615; but neither was there, it is to be noted, any express repeal of them. The consequence was, that by some it was supposed that both sets of Articles were to be in force; and among these seems to have been Ussher, who, when writing to a correspondent in England, says of the Irish: "We let them stand as they did before; but, for manifesting our agreement with the Church of England, we have received and approved your Articles also concluded in the year 1562."\* Whether Ussher, or any bishops agreeing with Ussher, required both the English and Irish Articles to be subscribed, is not clear; certainly most of the bishops, holding the Irish Articles to be impliedly revoked by the authoritative document of later date, treated the English as alone obligatory upon the clergy at their admission into the Church and institution to benefices. After the Restoration the Irish Articles fell entirely into disuse; and from that time the subscription required from the clergy by all the bishops was to the Canon enacting the Thirty-nine Articles.†

Bramhall, having succeeded in inducing Convocation to accept the Thirty-nine Articles, endeavoured to obtain their assent also to the English Canons. These, it is said, were in some respects supposed to conflict with the ideas of the Puritan party, to which the clergy leaned in opinion.‡ Their acceptance was also resisted upon the ground that they related to matters on which each

---

\* Ussher to Dr. Ward, 15th September, 1635.—*Works*, vol. xvi. p. 9.

† Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 177.

‡ Carte's *Ormonde*, vol. i. p. 149.—Strafford's *Letters*, vol. i. p. 381.



Church should exercise its judgment, accommodating its rules to its own peculiar circumstances—a reason which found support from Ussher. The result was, that distinct Canons were enacted, differing from the English in their arrangement, mode of expression, and in several of their provisions, but not on any points of importance. Agreement with the English Church was affirmed not only by the Canon as to the Thirty-nine Articles already cited, but also by another prohibiting the use in the Churches of any form of liturgy or divine service other than that which was established by law and comprised in the Book of Common Prayer.

Statutes designed to benefit the Church were obtained by Strafford, during his rule as Viceroy, from Parliament; the most important of which was one intended to prevent the alienation or improvident disposition of the lands belonging to the bishops and other ecclesiastical persons. This Act regulated the lettings which were thenceforth to be allowed of Church lands, fixed for them limited periods, and defined what rents might be reserved. It rendered any grant, by incumbents of sees or benefices, not in conformity with the powers thereby conferred, void against their successors. There was also an Act passed which facilitated the restoration of impropriations to the parishes.\*

In 1640 Strafford was finally removed from Ireland. His departure was followed by a series of events adverse to the welfare of the Church, which render its history for the next twenty years merely a record of depression and suffering: of calamities inflicted by external vio-

---

\* 10 & 11 Charles I., c. 2 (Irish); 10 & 11 Charles I., c. 3 (Irish).



lence, and neither caused nor increased by its own acts or defaults.

The first in order of these events was the insurrection which, from the magnitude it assumed, is known as the rebellion of 1641. On the night of the 23rd of October in that year, at a large number of places situate in the counties of the Ulster Plantation, the dwellings and settlements of the English were attacked by armed bands of the native Irish, and (as nothing of the kind was expected) with almost unresisted success. It is not improbable that the immediate cause which led to this outbreak was apprehension that proceedings hostile to the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, and designed to oppress such as adhered to it, would be taken by the Puritan party, who were rapidly becoming predominant in England; but, if so, this was only the proximate, and neither the sole nor the chief, cause. The native population which remained in Ulster after the Plantation were numerous. They were compelled to resign to the colonists the most valuable portions of their lands: they were treated as a subject and inferior race; and they regarded with indignation the ordinances which deprived them of their property and former social condition. Besides, they resented the loss of the independence which, until the Plantation, they and their chieftains enjoyed. To set these elements of disturbance in motion needed only—what the time and occasion furnished—ambitious leaders. The movement, under such guidance, assumed a character of greater magnitude than the redress of local grievances. A barbarous people, as the insurgents undoubtedly were, without the restraint of military discipline, may be always expected to indulge remorselessly

the passions which civil war engenders : and in the present instance, with a large proportion of the assailants, these were heightened to peculiar exasperation, since their incursions were made upon the soil from which they had been evicted, and against those who had dispossessed them. Hence, the insurrection was followed by extreme loss of life. The estimates of this loss by historians have varied much, and from the nature of the case no calculation can be relied upon as accurate ;\* since to the deaths in battle or other conflict of organized forces, which might have been counted, are to be added deaths caused by scattered bodies of insurgents who rose tumultuously over the country, of which there could not be any complete record. Many, also, driven from their homes to seek shelter in Dublin and other towns, were swept away by the hardships they endured or the diseases which they contracted in their flight, and thus perished for the most part unnoticed. The same causes which occasioned an excessive loss of life led to an unsparing destruction of property. The farm-houses and other buildings of the colonists, their chattels of every kind, were plundered or destroyed. The land became a waste.

The consequences of the rebellion of 1641 fell principally upon the members of the Established Church, the Scotch at first not being assailed, and having therefore time and opportunity to prepare for their own defence. The clergy were expelled or fled along with their congregations. Many churches and glebe-houses were reduced to ruin. The Church itself, as

---

\* See Note DD of Appendix.

a working institution, ceased to exist in many parts of Ulster.

Before the insurrection was suppressed, the great Civil War between the King and the English Parliament extended itself to Ireland. A party had been there previously formed which sympathized with and aided the Parliament. It was, as might be expected, hostile to the Roman Catholics, and desirous of avenging the sufferings which the Northern colonists had at that time endured ; but it was little less at enmity with Protestant Episcopalians, for they had almost universally been faithful to Charles. Under these circumstances, the Established Church throughout the entire island became subject to the assaults of two distinct classes of enemies, who, disagreeing on every other subject, agreed in seeking to effect its depression.

It was, however, not merely in reference to political questions that the English Parliament and those who adhered to it (whether English or Irish) in the conflict with the King, were adverse to the Established Churches of England and Ireland : they were even more opposed to the systems of Church government adopted by these Churches and to their liturgies and forms of prayer for public worship. Accordingly, in 1643, a Commission or body of persons, composed of more than one hundred Divines, and of some Peers and Members of the House of Commons, was appointed by the English Parliament, with directions that those nominated upon it should “confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things concerning the liturgy, discipline, and government of the Church of England, as should be proposed by either or both Houses of Parliament.”



This Commission, meeting in Henry the Seventh's Chapel, or the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, acquired the name of the Westminster Assembly. The opinions of the majority of its members were Calvinistic and Presbyterian; and the preponderance of these opinions among them was subsequently rendered more decided by the addition to their number of Commissioners sent to London from Scotland.

The Scotch Commissioners offered for adoption by Parliament a declaration in reference to ecclesiastical reform, termed the Solemn League and Covenant, which had been framed by Scotch Divines. It bound those who subscribed it to preserve the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland; to uphold the reformation of religion in England and Ireland according to the Word of God and the example of the best reformed Churches; to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising; also to endeavour, amongst other things, the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy, "that is" (it explained), "Church-government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissioners, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy."\*

---

\* Baxter states that the above explanation of prelacy was put in because many grave and reverend divines desired it; and by this explanation, he says, "it appears that it was only the English hierarchy or frame that was covenanted against, and that it was that which was then existent that was taken down." See letter of Archbishop Leighton: *Works* (ed. 1830), vol. i. p. clxxxiii.



The "Solemn League and Covenant" was submitted by Parliament to the Westminster Assembly; was there considered; and, having been after some amendments finally approved both by that Assembly and Parliament, it became the subject of an enactment, which described it as being for the peace and safety of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Beside sanctioning the Solemn League and Covenant, and thus condemning Episcopacy, the Westminster Assembly issued a Directory for public worship, a Confession of Faith, a longer and a shorter Catechism. These were intended to supersede the English Prayer-book, Articles of Faith, and Catechism. The Directory was a code of instructions as to public worship, which expressly set aside the former liturgy. The Confession was a standard of doctrine in character unquestionably Calvinistic.

When the "Solemn League and Covenant," and the other theological compendiums of the Assembly had attained acceptance in England, the Presbyterian party sought to have them introduced and put in force in Ireland. The "Solemn League" was first tried. It was rejected by the army under the command of the Marquis of Ormonde; but in the North there were Scotch troops, commanded by General Munroe, who had been sent from their own country by the King to aid in putting down the rebellion, and by this officer and his soldiers it was at once accepted. It was also received with favour by a very large number of the Ulster Protestants, generally of Scottish descent. In 1647 the Directory was first enforced in Ireland as obligatory on Episcopalians as well as Presbyterians.

Ormonde in that year surrendered Dublin to Commissioners of the Parliament, and they forthwith prohibited the use of the English Liturgy in the churches of that city, and ordered the regulations of the Directory to be followed.

For some time after Charles's death the authority of the Commonwealth of England was resisted in Ireland. Ultimately Cromwell triumphed. His success was followed by the suppression of the services of the Irish Established Church; so much so that external action on its part entirely ceased. The revenues of the bishoprics were seized for the purposes of the State; vacancies in the office were not filled. Presbyterianism also was at first discouraged. Religion it was proposed to maintain through the agency of persons "of pious life and conversation," who should be found by Commissioners (selected for the purpose) qualified with gifts for the preaching of the Gospel, and by paying these persons stipends from the public revenues.\* Afterwards Cromwell relaxed the severity of his rule towards the Presbyterian clergy, and contributed to their support;† but there was no change in his treatment of the Episcopalian clergy, whom he seems to have regarded as enemies of his government, and whose public ministrations were (with only a few exceptions) therefore silenced.‡ Finally, his victorious despotism established

---

\* Reid's *Hist. of Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 160.

† See *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, by Dr. Killen, late Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, vol. ii. pp. 104–107.

‡ Cromwell, when excusing his policy towards the episcopal clergy in England, told Archbishop Ussher that he was advised by his council

itself upon a total ruin of the civil and ecclesiastical polity which had been before upheld in Ireland by the English Government.

The last appointment made by Charles the First to a bishopric in Ireland was, in December, 1646, of Edward Parry (consecrated 28th March, 1647) to Killaloe. At the death of Charles I. the following Irish bishoprics were vacant:—(1) Ferns and Leighlin; (2) Kilfenora; (3) Waterford and Lismore; and (4) Killala and Achonry. Between the death of Charles I. and the Restoration the following Bishops of the Irish Bench died, viz.:—(1) Chappel (Cork and Ross), in 1649; (2) Sibthorp (Limerick), in 1649; (3) Bulkeley (Dublin), in 1650; (4) Martin (Meath), in 1650; (5) Golburne (Kildare), in 1650; (6) Parry (Killaloe), in 1650; (7) Buckworth (Dromore), in 1652; (8) Synge (Cloyne), in 1652; (9) Ussher (Armagh), in 1656; (10) Hamilton (Cashel), in 1659. Until the Restoration there was no attempt to fill any of the bishoprics which at the death of Charles I. were, or thus after his death became, vacant.

---

not to grant any indulgence to men who were restless and implacable enemies to his person and government.—Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 274.

## CHAPTER IX.

### USSHER AND BEDELL.

**D**URING the Protectorate of Cromwell, Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, died. The part which he took in connexion with some of the most important events affecting the Church of Ireland—especially the preparation of the Articles of 1615, and the enactment of the English Articles in 1634—has been narrated when referring to these periods; but more than an incidental notice of a prelate, whose pre-eminence in learning was in his own day universally admitted, is called for in any history of the Church of Ireland, however brief.

James Ussher was of an English family, named Neville, which in the reign of King John settled in Ireland, and from the founder of the Irish branch holding the office of Usher to that prince, he assumed the latter name. He was indebted for his early education to a singular circumstance. James the First, before his accession, sent two Scotchmen, named Fullerton and Hamilton, to Dublin, to promote his interests among the Protestant gentry. To disguise from the jealous observation of Elizabeth their real objects, they assumed the character of teachers, opened a school in Dublin, and gave instruction to many (among whom was Ussher)



which, in the condition of the country at that time, they could not otherwise have received.\*

In the College which Elizabeth founded, Fullerton and Hamilton were appointed Fellows, in addition to those named in the Charter. Ussher came with them as a student; was then chosen to be one of the Scholars; afterwards he was a Fellow, and ultimately Professor of Divinity. From the last office he was, as has been already mentioned, promoted to the bishopric of Meath, and thence translated to the archbishopric of Armagh.

When the insurrection of 1641 broke out Ussher was in England. The disturbed state, then, of the North of Ireland, and subsequently of the entire kingdom, the predominance of the Puritan party, who were hostile to episcopacy, and ultimately adopted measures for its suppression, prevented his return again to Ireland. He suffered great losses of property in the rebellion. Soon after it began he, like the other bishops of the Irish Church, ceased to receive any revenues from the lands of his See. Charles gave him the bishopric of Carlisle *in commendam*, but he derived little from this gift; another attempt to provide for him by a grant from the See-lands of Armagh seems also to have failed;† and before his death he was indebted to friends.

Ussher, so long as he was permitted, discharged the duties of the episcopal office with admirable diligence,

---

\* Hamilton was by James, in 1622, created a Peer, with the title of Viscount Claneboye. "Whenever," says Dr. Parr, one of Ussher's biographers, "the Archbishop recounted the providences of God to himself, he would say that he took this for one remarkable instance of it, that he had the opportunity and advantage of his education from those men (*i.e.* Fullerton and Hamilton), who came hither from chance."

† Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 271.

setting to his clergy an example of personal piety and active exertion, and publishing admonitions and instructions to guide them. He was least successful as a ruler. "For the governing part of his function (says Bishop Burnet) he was not made: he had too gentle a soul for the work of reforming abuses." We ought to take into account, however, when judging him, the difficulties caused by the condition of society in his time and the entirely exceptional circumstances with which a bishop then had to deal.

When detained in England, in 1641, Ussher joined Charles I. at Oxford; and he appears to have been at that time and afterwards consulted by the King, and much in his confidence. His counsel on one momentous occasion is recorded. In conjunction with Juxon, Bishop of London, he advised that the royal assent should be refused to the Bill for the attainder of Strafford. When, contrary to his remonstrances, the assent was given, he attended Strafford in the interval until his execution, and accompanied him to the scaffold.

No question was more debated between Charles and the Long Parliament than the continuance of Episcopacy in England. The English Divines induced Ussher to join them in defending the Order, and two tracts were written by him, having relation to the subject. One was entitled, "The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans briefly laid down," and the other, "A Geographical and Historical Disquisition touching the Asia properly so called." The ground of Episcopacy (he asserts) is derived partly from the pattern prescribed by God in the Old Testament, and partly from the imitation thereof brought in by the Apostles, and confirmed

by Christ himself in the time of the New. Its history he traces from the appointment of Timothy by St. Paul as bishop at Ephesus. The Seven Churches mentioned in the Apocalypse he holds were metropolitical, and the angels of them, spoken of by St. John, their bishops. For the age next after that time he mentions (to use his own words) a succession of witnesses to Episcopacy.

These tracts are only directed to maintain upon historical grounds the office of bishop, and do not discuss its nature. In reference to that subject Ussher's views are said to have been extremely moderate. He is reported by his chaplain, Dr. Bernard, when interrogated upon the point, to have answered, . . . "I have ever declared my opinion to be that *Episcopus et Presbyter gradum tantum differunt, non ordine*, and consequently, in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination of presbyters standeth valid." With reference, however, to some ordinations by presbyters in England, and lest from his opinion of the office he might be supposed to sanction them, he added . . . "holding, as I do, that a bishop hath a superiority in degree over a presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such presbyters as have severed themselves from those bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical."\*

It is not improbable that it was the moderation of his views in relation to this subject which suggested either to himself, or other advisers of the King, that he should draw up some scheme of episcopal government in connexion with synods, which might be offered as a

---

\* Cited in Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, p. 258, from Bernard *On Ordination*, p. 125.



compromise to the parliamentary party. This he seems to have done a short time before the civil war commenced ; but his propositions were not debated, with a view to being a subject of treaty, until the King was a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, when the clerical part of the Commissioners sent by the Parliament to the King received them favourably ; but the lay rejected them. What they were appears from a tract published by Dr. Bernard after his death, entitled, “ The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church,” which is on the title-page stated to have been drawn up in 1641, “ as an expedient for the prevention of those troubles which afterwards arose about Church government.”

To state the scheme put forward in this paper shortly—it proposed that the rural deans should be suffragan bishops, such as those sanctioned by an Act of Henry VIII., each with a synod of the rectors within his precinct, and that according to the votes of the majority of the synod matters should be determined. The diocesan bishops were to have higher authority, and also to act with synods, at which these suffragans and a select number of rectors were to attend, and the greater matters to be considered and decided, the majority prevailing : and at the head over all was to be a provincial synod, composed of the diocesan and suffragan bishops, and of clergy elected by the dioceses, at which the Archbishop of the province was to preside.\*

---

\* In 1670, Archbishop Leighton, who had many opinions in common with Ussher, endeavoured, but without success, to compose the controversies in Scotland respecting Church government, upon the basis of an Episcopacy acting with presbyters and synods. See Burnet's *Own Time*, book ii., and Leighton's tract, entitled, *Defence of a Moderate Episcopacy*.



During the Protectorate, Ussher was treated with respect by Cromwell, and was on some occasions consulted by him; but, notwithstanding, he was unable to obtain any permission for the public use of the Church services. Upon the Archbishop's death, Cromwell ordered a public funeral, but his contribution to the expense was of inadequate amount, and left much to be paid by the surviving relatives.

Selden—and no man was more competent to pronounce judgment on the subject—declared\* that the learning of Ussher amounted to a prodigy. Even as early as his collegiate career it was recognized: *acatholicorum doctissimus* were the terms in which even then he was described upon the Continent. Unquestionably in the department of ecclesiastical history he is without a rival either in his own time or since.

The theological opinions of Ussher, at the date of the Articles of 1615, are reflected in them. Upon the subject of predestination he appears to have modified his views in the latter years of his life. "I can testify (says Dr. Brian Walton), that having often discoursed with the late Most Reverend Father in God, James, Lord Primate of Armagh, concerning divers controversies in divinity, and in particular the last time he was in London, which was not long before his death, concerning the controversies of grace and free-will, election and reprobation, and the dependents thereupon: he did declare his utter dislike of the doctrine of reprobation, and that he held the universality of Christ's death, and that

---

\* Jacobus Usserius, vir summâ pietate, judicio singulari, usque ad miraculum doctus, et literis severioribus promovendis natus.—Selden, *Preface to Marmora Arundeliana*.

not only in respect of sufficiency, but also in regard of efficacy, so that all men were thereby salveable: and that the reason why all were not saved was because they did not accept of salvation offered, and that the grace of conversion was not irresistible, but that men might, and often did, reject the same: that in these points he did not approve the doctrine of Geneva, but was wholly of Bishop Overall's opinions."\* Hammond, however, who agrees with Walton in stating that Ussher "did for many years acknowledge universal redemption," shows that this was with a qualification, or as he terms it, a distinction, *non ex æquo pro omnibus*—a distinction which, in the form of its expression, is of the more importance, because it is in direct contradiction to words used upon the subject by one of the early Christian writers.†

Ussher has been justly censured for his views in reference to the political treatment of Roman Catholics. A sermon which he preached on the subject drew (as has been already mentioned) reproof from Archbishop Hampton; and afterwards, in 1626, upon the occasion of a proposal to enlist Roman Catholics in the army, he

\* Overall was Bishop of Lichfield (1614–1619); then was translated to Norwich. Burnet, in his comment on Article XVII., says that he espoused Arminian tenets. Part of the Church Catechism relating to the Sacraments was attributed to him; but seems Rowell's.

† The words of Hammond (as cited by Dr. Elrington, *Life of Ussher*, p. 291) are:—"The Bishop (Ussher) did for many years acknowledge universal redemption, but that with a distinction of *non ex æquo pro omnibus*, which puts me in mind of the words of Holy Maximus that *χριστὸς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*, which last words (when I read them long since) I could not guess why they were added, till I saw there was somebody that granted the *ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ πάντων*, but denied the *ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ*."

joined others of the Irish bishops in a protest against toleration.\* But in judging a great man in reference to a question of this character, the ideas of his age must be kept in mind; he cannot be measured by the standard of subsequent enlightenment. At this time no theological writer in England had advocated toleration of dissent from an established religion, and even statesmen and legislation generally proceeded upon a contrary principle.

The biographers of Ussher represent him in every capacity (except that of ruler, in which he was open to the reproach already mentioned) as an almost perfect character. "Passion, pride, self-will (says Burnet), seemed not to be so much as in his nature." The meekness, forbearance, unperturbed temper, and habitual cheerfulness, which he displayed under many trials, were especially remarked.

It is proper to note that he attributed much importance to the effects produced by preaching; that he considered this duty more incumbent upon bishops than was generally supposed; and that in his diocese, and afterwards in England, until prohibited, he was

---

Baxter, who also testifies to Ussher's later views, would seem to have himself held opinions similar to those which Hammond attributes to Ussher. See Bishop Harold Browne on Article XVII. They may also be traced in *Paradise Lost*:—

"Some I have chosen of peculiar grace  
Elect above the rest; so is my will:  
The rest shall hear me call, and oft be warned  
Their sinful state, and to appease betimes  
Th' incensed Deity, while offered grace  
Invites."

\* Mant, *History*, vol. i. p. 423.



frequently in the pulpit; speaking extempore, with fluency, in a plain, unadorned style, easily understood, with much success in reaching the hearts and consciences of his hearers.

Contemporary with Ussher, Bedell presided over the diocese of Kilmore—a bishop of apostolic piety and zeal, deserving to be placed beside Ussher in any record of their times. Of him Father Paul, the great historian of the Council of Trent, with whom he had become intimate, when he resided in Italy as chaplain to Sir Henry Wotton (ambassador from James I. to the Court of Venice), said, “that he had learned from him during their intercourse more of theology and practical religion than from any other person during his whole life.”

This exemplary prelate was English by birth, and came over to Ireland in consequence of an invitation (suggested by Ussher) from the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, to become their Provost. Accepting the office, he held it for about two years, during which he effected considerable improvements in the discipline and rules of the institution. Of these James, who thence advanced him to the united See of Kilmore and Ardagh, takes notice in his letter of appointment—“By his care, and good government of the College, there have been (the King says) wrought great reformatiions to our singular contentment.”

The dioceses over which Bedell was to preside had been long neglected. He has himself recorded their condition—“The churches unrepaired, and in a manner ruined”: incumbents “holding two, or three, or four, or more vicarages apiece”: some of the best of the



clergy English, “ who had not the tongue of the people, nor could perform any divine offices, or converse with them,” so that they could be understood. To meet these evils he exerted himself with energy, resigning the bishopric of Ardagh in order to exhibit his condemnation of pluralities ; examining with great strictness the candidates for Orders ; appointing to benefices with judgment ; and obliging residence. He endeavoured to reach the natives through their own language,\* causing a catechism, forms of prayer, and selected passages from Scripture to be translated into Irish, and giving assistance towards an Irish Version of the Old Testament, which was afterwards in 1685 published.

At the commencement of the insurrection of 1641 Bedell was treated by the natives with forbearance and respect, and was even allowed to give shelter to fugitives from the rebels. This indulgence was due very much to the example and precept of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore, Dr. Swiney, who offered, if it were necessary for the protection of Bedell, to take up his residence with him. After about two months Bedell, refusing to send away those whom he sheltered, was removed by force, under an allegation that it had been so ordered by the Council of Kilkenny, and was confined in a castle upon an island in Loughouter, where, with his son and chaplain, he was kept until they were exchanged for some leaders of the rebels who had been made prisoners by the loyalist party. Forbidden to proceed to Dublin, he took refuge with a clergyman in the neighbourhood of the castle ; but his health and strength were

---

\* Bedell, when Provost, had encouraged in Trinity College the study of the Irish language.

then much impaired, and he did not long survive his removal.

Bedell did not publish any theological works: some writings of his, it was said, were destroyed or lost during the rebellion; but if so, it is not probable that they were either numerous or important. His life was spent in the practice of piety, and in impressing upon others its necessity. Christianity in his teaching was regarded, not so much as a system of opinions, as a divine principle renewing and transforming the heart and life: "with Augustine"—he used to say—"I look for fruit, not leaves."

After his death a remarkable testimony to his excellence was given by the conduct of the very people who had been in the neighbourhood of the place where he was buried most active in promoting the success of the rebellion. Numbers of them followed his funeral, and while declaring that he should be the last of the English, expressed in the strongest terms his praise. One bystander, a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, moved by the remembrance of his many virtues, exclaimed aloud, *sit anima mea cum Bedello*.\*

---

\* Bedell has had several biographers. One of the latest and best sketches of his life will be found in Wills' *Lives of Illustrious Irishmen*, vol. iv. p. 130.

## CHAPTER X.

[1660-1685.]

WHEN the rule of the Commonwealth was established in Ireland, the entire kingdom was treated as if it had been involved in rebellion, and as if the landed property of its inhabitants was forfeited to the State. Those who could prove their "constant good affection" to the Parliamentary party during the Civil War, as also husbandmen, ploughmen, and persons of like condition, who, it was thought, would be of use to any new colonists that might be introduced, were alone exempt from proscription.

The consequence of this policy was that extensive territories in Ireland were placed at the disposal of the English Parliament. These they proceeded to redistribute, but conducted the redistribution upon principles differing materially from those which guided the arrangements of the Plantation under James. Then portions of the forfeited lands were reserved for the dispossessed natives in the localities which were colonized; now, in three provinces (Leinster, Munster, and Ulster), the native Irish (with the exceptions that have been mentioned), and many Roman Catholic Anglo-Irish, were ordered to migrate to Connaught, and in the uncivilized districts of that province to accept whatever settlements

might be allotted to them as a substitute for their former interests in landed property.

The effect of the transplantation (as the proceeding thus decreed was called)—although in practice it was carried out with dispensations in addition to the prescribed exceptions—was very great. From Leinster and Munster it removed the most influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and placed them in localities where they could no longer endanger the English authority. It consequently reduced the political power of the Roman Catholic portion of the people to a condition of extreme weakness.\*

In the room of the landed proprietors who were now deprived of their estates, new owners were introduced. These were Protestant in religion, but imbued with sympathies differing from those of the old gentry of Anglo-Irish race, who were almost all loyalists, and attached to the Church which had been established in alliance with the Crown. Many of the new settlers were as little favourable to Episcopacy as the Scotch colonists in Ulster.

Hence, although there was in Ireland under the

---

\* The most complete account of the transplantation of the Irish to Connaught will be found in Mr. Prendergast's *Cromwellian Settlement in Ireland*. He seems to think that this oppressive measure was adopted in order to protect the colonists; but there is some reason to think there was also a vindictive motive, originating in resentment caused by the sufferings of the Protestants during the insurrection of 1641. Certainly Cromwell assigned this reason for his own cruelty in the war. In 1649, when answering a remonstrance of the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, he said: . . . "You, unprovoked, put the English to the most unheard-of and barbarous massacre (without respect of age or sex) that the sun ever beheld." . . . "We are come to ask an account of the innocent blood that hath been shed." See Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Cromwell*, vol. ii. pp. 210-223, ed. 1871.



Commonwealth a considerable increase in the number, strength, and influence of the Protestant part of the people, this did not bring a proportional increase of adherents to the Protestant Episcopal Church. On the contrary, it may be doubted whether its interests ever at any other time sunk to a lower point of depression ; the public ministration of its clergy being forbidden by the State, and a most active and, owing to the success of the Puritans in England, a most influential class of Protestants regarding its system with dislike. In Ulster Presbyterianism, which from the time of the Plantation had been the rival of the Church, gained ground ; and in the rest of the country the principles either of Presbyterianism or of the Independents (from whom Cromwell's soldiers were largely recruited) found numerous supporters. The result was that a number of the parish churches and the spiritual care of the congregations accustomed to assemble in them became, especially in Ulster, vested in ministers who had not received Episcopal ordination.

Owing to these circumstances the Church in Ireland had, at the Restoration, to encounter opposition not merely from the Roman Catholics, but from a Protestant party also. Of the former, however, as they had ceased to be formidable, little account was taken ; and the latter were not strong enough successfully to resist the tide of loyal enthusiasm which, having in England carried triumphantly the re-establishment of the Monarchy and of the Episcopal Church in the same position as they held before the time of the Commonwealth, was now extending itself to Ireland with equal force and like results.

Charles and his Ministers—the most influential of the latter being as to English affairs the Chancellor, Lord Clarendon, and as to Irish, the Marquis (afterwards Duke) of Ormonde—were themselves decidedly in favour of the course pursued in reference to the Church in England. Accordingly, perceiving that public opinion there was on the side of Episcopacy, and would support the policy of maintaining it, they determined to follow up their recognition of the restored position of the English Church by extending a similar recognition to the Irish; the King announcing that he would proceed to fill the Irish bishoprics, which, with the exception of eight, were all vacant.\*

At a somewhat later date Charles addressed to the Irish clergy a letter in which, further indicating his future ecclesiastical policy, he stated that he would by all the ways and means in his power preserve their rights and those of the Church of Ireland, so far as by law and justice he might; and that nothing could give him more content than, when occasion should be offered, to add to the revenues thereof (which, he observed, had been too much diminished by rapacious or improvident hands), and to restore it to its ancient patrimony—in proof of which he referred to letters he had sent granting such inappropriate and forfeited tithes as were still in his gift to the incumbents of the parishes liable to pay them.†

---

\* The eight surviving bishops were—Bramhall (Derry), Fulwar (Ardfert), Williams (Ossory), Jones (Clogher), Henry Leslie (Down), Maxwell (Kilmore), Bayly (Clonfert), John Leslie (Raphoe). For the bishoprics which were vacant see page 139, *supra*.

† 24th December, 1660.—Carte's *Ormonde*, vol. iv. p. 22.

One of the vacant bishoprics was Armagh. To this, the highest office in the Irish Church, Bramhall, one of the eight surviving bishops, was translated from the See of Derry. For this promotion he was recommended alike by his merits and by his services as well to the King himself as to the King's father. Before the death of the latter he had been the chief agent in carrying out for Strafford the ecclesiastical policy of the King's Government in Ireland, and had in the discharge of these arduous duties displayed remarkable judgment and ability.\* In the controversy between Charles and the English Parliament he took the King's side, and had consequently experienced the enmity of the Irish Parliament when this assembly, after Strafford's departure from Ireland, allied itself with the English Parliament. At that time Bramhall, along with Strafford's Secretary Sir George Radcliffe, Sir Richard Bolton the Lord Chancellor, and Sir Gerard Lowther the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, was impeached by the Irish House of Commons, and owed his safety to the active interference of the King. Again in danger, after the establishment of the Commonwealth, for adherence to the loyalist party,† Bramhall had joined Charles II. upon the Continent, and remained in attendance upon him during his exile.

The translation of Bramhall to Armagh was followed by the King nominating two Archbishops and ten Bishops to fill vacancies in the Irish Sees, of which one

---

\* See pages 126-129, *supra*.

† Cromwell was extremely hostile to Bramhall. He called him "the Irish Canterbury" (Laud), and is said to have expressed much regret that he escaped before he could be arrested in Ireland.



was caused by this promotion, and the rest by the deaths of Episcopal incumbents who had died before the Restoration without successors having been appointed. Subsequently all whom the King had selected were, on the 27th of January, 1661, consecrated by Bramhall as Archbishop of Armagh, four other Bishops assisting. The ceremony was attended by the Lords Justices, by the Mayor and Aldermen of Dublin, and by a parliamentary Convention which had assembled before Parliament was regularly summoned.\*

Among the Bishops who were upon this occasion consecrated was Jeremy Taylor, then justly reputed the most eloquent of English Divines.† He had held during the Commonwealth a Lectureship in Ireland at Lisburn, which appears to have escaped interference. He came thither from England, having suffered much during the Civil War, in which he ardently espoused the King's cause. The reputation of his writings was about this time at the highest. Under the disadvantage of circumstances most adverse to study he had sent forth from remote retreats, in which he took shelter from the persecution inflicted by the dominant party upon the Church of England, not merely sermons and addresses of extraordinary eloquence, but elaborate treatises upon

---

\* Mason, in his *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral* (p. 192), has compiled a minute account of this remarkable ceremony, from a MS. of Dudley Loftus, then Judge of the Prerogative Court, preserved in Marsh's Library, Dublin, and from a newspaper called *The Kingdom's Intelligencer* of 11th February, 1661. See Note EE of Appendix.

† Hallam, speaking of Taylor as an orator, says:—"We have no reason to believe, or rather much reason to disbelieve, that he had any competitor in other languages."—*Literature of Europe*, vol. ii. p. 360, 3rd edition.



profound theological subjects, characterized by much learning and research.

The popularity of Taylor's practical writings has survived the vicissitudes of literary taste. He had not the precision of expression requisite to treat theological questions of difficulty, or to conduct controversy successfully; but in the expression of devotional feeling, occasionally of elevated thought and pathetic reflection, he rises to a height which, except it be by some relics of primitive Christianity, has never been surpassed.\*

Among Taylor's merits not the least must be reckoned that he was the first English author who issued an elaborate argumentative pleading for toleration upon questions of a theological nature. His celebrated treatise, "The Liberty of Prophesying," written with that object, was published in 1647. It is characterized by the same eloquence and learning as mark his other writings, and by, perhaps, more ingenuity of argument and reasoning. It produced, at the time, great effect upon public opinion, and thus prepared the way for the more accurate and comprehensive views of a later period upon the subject.

The qualities which recommended Taylor for one of the vacant bishoprics also suggested his selection to preach upon the occasion of the Consecration. His

---

\* Taylor's biographers, Bishop Heber and Archdeacon Bonney, both cite the characteristic sentence, in which Dr. Parr, placing him in a pre-eminence shared only by Hooker and Barrow, pronounces Hooker the object of our reverence, Barrow of our admiration, and Taylor of our love. *Ὁκνηρον μὲν σέβω, θαυμάζω δὲ Βάρρονον, καὶ φιλῶ Ταίλωρον.* Heber, probably justly, places Taylor first of this triumvirate, "in imagination, in interest, in that which properly and exclusively deserves the name of genius."

sermon was then published, and is always printed in the collections of his writings. It discusses the questions connected with the episcopal office, and contends for the views respecting them entertained by the High Church party. The apostles, he holds, were the first rulers of Christ's followers; but their office was not to die with them: it was as necessary for perpetuating as for founding the Church. The eminence of power which they enjoyed must therefore be transmitted: hence the order of bishops was requisite; it was to take the place of the Apostles as to government, and to possess similar authority. Accordingly, to bishops he attributes the foundation and preservation of the Church—the foundation, not only because the Apostles, who were (he says) bishops, had been the first preachers of the Gospel and planters of churches, but because the apostolical men whom the Apostles used in planting and disseminating religion were by all antiquity affirmed to have been diocesan bishops: the preservation, because they alone have the power of ordaining the clergy.

Not long after the consecration of the Bishops, a Parliament, which had been previously convened, met. The Roman Catholics making no exertions to return representatives to the House of Commons, the members of that assembly were Protestants, either belonging to the Episcopalian party, or persons who, if not of the Episcopalian party, were yet of moderate ideas, indisposed to thwart the policy of the Government. The prevailing tone of sentiment among both Lords and Commons was to support the Monarchy and the Church which was in alliance with the Monarchy.

The duty of preaching before the two Houses of

Parliament was entrusted to Taylor, who had become Bishop of Down. Choosing for his text the words, "to obey is better than sacrifice," he urged the obligation of obedience to superior authority, both in Church and State; but accompanied his observations with admonitions to his hearers, who exercised part of this superior authority, that they on their side should exhibit mercy as well as justice—duties which the questions about to come for their consideration in respect of the forfeited estates rendered especially fitting to be inculcated.

One of the first proceedings of Parliament was to pronounce in favour of the Episcopal Church as it had been formerly established. All subjects of the kingdom were enjoined to conform to it, and to the liturgy as appointed by law. At the same time the "Solemn League and Covenant" was expressly condemned.

These declarations were in complete harmony with contemporary parliamentary proceedings in England. Both were in pursuance of a policy which aimed at the sole establishment of an episcopal ecclesiastical system; and they did so, without offering any compensation for the removal of such persons as, having under the Commonwealth come into possession of benefices, did not possess the qualifications required by the Establishment, or could not conscientiously accept its discipline.

The principal sufferers by this policy were the Presbyterians. They complained that it was a violation of promises made by the King before his Restoration in a Declaration he had issued from Breda, wherein he had stated that no man should be disquieted or called in question for differences in matters of religion, which did not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that he



would be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament as, upon mature deliberation, should be offered to him for the full granting of such indulgence.

Whether the declaration from Breda did or did not reach to the extent alleged by the Presbyterian party, there seems little doubt that it would have been wiser to have yielded the claims which were founded upon its language. If this course had been adopted, it would probably have then retained, in connexion with the parish Churches of the Establishment in both countries, all the Protestants ; their children and descendants would have grown up in habits of attendance upon the Churches ; afterwards, as the occupying incumbents died off, successors of Episcopalian principles would have taken their place ; and time and usage might have been trusted to gain over whatever in the end remained of dissent among the congregations.

At the same time it must be admitted that the engagements which, by pledging themselves to the Solemn League and Covenant, almost all the ministers not episcopally ordained had entered into against prelacy, raised difficulties in the way of concession. It was thought uncertain whether, if protected in their titles, they would not use their position to create an anti-Episcopal feeling among churchmen, and thus, it might be, lead to a schism upon a point of the most vital importance.

Influenced by these considerations, at least as much as by any theological views in reference to Episcopacy, the English and Irish Parliaments became less and less inclined to conciliation of the Protestant Nonconformists, and more and more strict in excluding from the benefices of the Established Churches every person who did not



derive his orders from Bishops. Acts of Uniformity were passed for both England and Ireland, which enacted that no person should thenceforth be capable of being admitted to any benefice, nor should he presume to consecrate and administer the Lord's Supper, before such time as he should be ordained priest, according to the form and manner in the Book of Common Prayer prescribed, unless he had formerly been made priest by Episcopal ordination: and which, having thus dealt with the case of future admission to benefices, added a provision in relation to existing incumbents, that any minister then in possession of a benefice who had not been Episcopally ordained, unless before a prescribed day he obtained such ordination, should be *ipso facto* deprived.

The Irish Act of Uniformity\* was not passed until 1665; but in the interval from the King's Restoration to that date the Irish Bishops had acted upon the supposition that Episcopal ordination was necessary in order to establish title to a benefice. When the clergy at the Visitations presented their letters of orders, if they appeared to be from a non-Episcopal authority, they were held not to show a valid title. Bramhall, in his diocese, where the orders of many incumbents in possession were Presbyterian, being desirous to retain them, offered to reordain any thus circumstanced, and accompanied the proposal by a declaration that he did not thereby dispute the value of their previous ordination, nor those acts they had exercised by virtue of it, but that he did not see how they could recover their tithes, if any were

---

\* 17 & 18 Charles II., ch. 6 (Ireland).

to refuse to pay them, unless they were Episcopally ordained.\* Bramhall's proposal met some acceptance in his own diocese; but in the other Ulster dioceses the clergy who had not received Episcopal ordination united in rejecting any overtures from the bishops for their re-ordination, and were deprived.

In England, beside pressing for indulgence, the Protestant Dissenters sought to have the Prayer-book revised. The same petition had been made to James I. by the Puritans; and he, after a conference with Divines representing on the one side the Church, and on the other the advocates for reform, had, of his own prerogative, directed alterations to be made in Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book without submitting them to Parliament or to either Convocation. In a proclamation he said—"We thought meet, with consent of the bishops and other learned men, that some small things might rather be explained than changed." And, to carry out the same idea, when some occasional prayers

---

\* It will be observed that Bramhall put the case upon legal, not theological, grounds. He accordingly introduced into the letters of orders issued to those whom he reordained the words, "non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit) nec validitatem aut invaliditatem eorum determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forensicarum condemnantes, quos proprio judici relinquimus: sed solummodo supplentes quicquid prius defuit per canones ecclesiæ Anglicanæ requisitum."—Vesey's *Life*. See further, as to the position of ministers with Presbyterian ordination at this time in possession of benefices, Note FF of Appendix.

Similar difficulties arose in Scotland on the introduction there of Episcopacy. Leighton, who had been ordained by a Presbyterian authority, received from English Bishops the orders of deacon and priest before he was consecrated a Bishop in Scotland. He held that this did not imply any nullity in his former orders, but merely that the Bishops received him according to their own rules.—See *Life*, prefixed to Pearson's edition of Leighton's works, p. xlv.

were at that time introduced, there were prefixed to them the words, "An enlargement of thanksgiving for divers benefits by way of explanation."\*

The Catechism was completed in its present form under James, the part at the end which treats of the Sacraments being then added. The rest of it had been contained in, and was continued with slight alteration from, the first Prayer-book of Edward VI.

The result of the demand for revision being renewed after the Restoration, was that numerous alterations (it is said no less than 600) were added to those which James had made in Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book. These were enacted by Parliament, having been previously sanctioned by the Convocation of Canterbury, with proxies from York. The revised Prayer-book, authorized in England, was submitted to the Irish Convocation and Parliament. Approved by both, it afterwards, with some additions, was by a statute of the latter brought into use in the Irish Church; and the assent and consent of every clergyman, then in possession of or thereafter to be appointed to any benefice in Ireland, to all things therein contained and prescribed was required.†

---

\* It was supposed that the alterations, if regarded as "explanations," might come within a clause of Queen Elizabeth's Act, enabling, under certain circumstances, the Sovereign, with advice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to ordain further ceremonies. The amended Book, however, was so far sanctioned by Convocation that it was ordered to be provided for churches.—*Procter on the Prayer-book*, ch. iv.

† 17 & 18 Charles II., ch. 6 (Irish). The Act described the Prayer-book as annexed to it. The Book in the Record Office, Ireland, is a Manuscript. See Dr. Stephens' edition of the Book of Common Prayer for Ireland, printed for the Ecclesiastical History Society. The statute enacted the use of the various services, describing them in express terms, and including the Ordinal.



The following were among the changes at this time introduced into the Prayer-book by the English Convocations and Parliament. A new Preface was prefixed. As there had been under James I. an entirely new version of the Bible,\* this version was substituted for the former in the Prefatory Sentences, in the Epistles, and Gospels, and (with the exception of the Psalter, the Ten Commandments, and some portions in the Communion Service) in all the other extracts from the Bible. In the description of the person who was to read the absolution in the morning and evening services, the word "priest" was substituted for "minister." To the former occasional prayers were added a second prayer "in the time of dearth and famine"; two prayers for Ember week; prayers for Parliament, and "for all sorts and conditions of men"; a Thanksgiving for restoring public peace at home, and "the General Thanksgiving." In the prayer for the Church Militant was inserted the clause "we bless Thy holy name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear." An explanation at the end of the Communion Service—that kneeling at the Communion did not imply adoration—which had been contained in Edward's second Prayer-book, and was omitted in Queen Elizabeth's, was restored; but with the substitution of the words "corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" for the

---

\* The new version was published in 1611. There was not any Act of Parliament or enactment of either of the English Convocations or proclamation of the king to direct its use in reading the lessons or otherwise in the services. From superior excellence it superseded preceding versions. When it had been thus introduced and adopted in England the Irish clergy followed the example of their English brethren.



former words, "any real or essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." Services for the 30th January and 29th May (the anniversaries of the execution of Charles I. and the accession of Charles II.) were added; and also forms of prayer to be used at sea, and a service for "the baptism of those of riper years." In the Office for ordaining priests, after the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," which were in the Ordinals of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, were inserted the words "for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands." In the form of consecrating Bishops, in place of the former words, "Take the Holy Ghost," were substituted the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands."\*

The additions, which, as has been mentioned, were made in Ireland to the English revised Prayer-book, were a prayer for the chief governor or governors of Ireland, and a service for the 23rd of October, the anniversary of the commencement of the Rebellion of 1641. This day had by a previous Act been ordered to be observed in the churches, by saying morning prayer, and giving thanks for deliverance and preservation from the rebellion.†

When the revised English Prayer-book was under consideration by the Irish Convocation, Bramhall, as Archbishop of Armagh, presided in the Upper House.

---

\* See further as to alterations made by this Prayer-book, Note GG of Appendix.

† 14 & 15 Charles II., sess. 4, ch. 23 (Ireland), A. D. 1662.

He did not, however, live to see it enacted by Parliament, his death occurring in the month of June, 1663.

The connection of this very eminent prelate with important events in the history of the Irish Church, and the ability which on these occasions he displayed, have been already noticed. Equal praise must be awarded him in his relations to the dioceses of which, successively, he was appointed bishop, whether we regard his rule over the clergy, or his own conduct in his high office. In both cases he encountered difficulties which nothing but a rare union of wisdom, energy, and firmness could have overcome. Nor was his eminence confined to the engagements and occupations of active life. His writings are of remarkable excellence, eminently characterized by original thought and reasoning.

Upon Bramhall's death, Margetson succeeded him in the See of Armagh. Like his predecessor, he was an Englishman, and, like him, had been induced by Strafford to come to Ireland, where his first appointment was to the Deanery of Waterford. During the time of the Commonwealth he took refuge in England. Returning to Ireland at the Restoration, he was appointed Archbishop of Dublin, from which preferment he was now translated. His judicious administration of the affairs of the dioceses which he ruled, his piety, humility, and munificence, were generally acknowledged by his contemporaries.\*

When the Protestant Episcopal Church had been re-established after the Restoration, its pecuniary inte-

---

\* See Cotton's *Fasti*, vol. iii. p. 22; and also Harris's edition of Ware's *Bishops*.

rests were not neglected by the Irish Parliament. Its estates had been among the property confiscated by the Commonwealth. By the Acts of Settlement and of Explanation,\* passed as a compromise of the claims for restoration of legal or innocent owners unjustly dispossessed by the Commonwealth, the lands of the Church were given back and confirmed to it. In addition, all impropriations and appropriate tithes which had become forfeited to, or otherwise vested in, the Crown, and had not been as yet distributed, were granted to the Church, and settled upon the incumbents of the parishes where the tithes were payable.

---

\* 14 & 15 Charles II, ch. 2, and 17 & 18 Charles II., ch. 2 (Irish).

## CHAPTER XI.

[1685-1702.]

IN Ireland, from the time when the authority of the Crown of England had been first acknowledged, until the death of Charles II., the uniform policy pursued by successive English Governments (even when, as in the reign of James I., it was desired to conciliate the native Irish), was to maintain the ascendancy of the colonists over the rest of the people. During the portion of this period which elapsed subsequent to the Supremacy Act (excepting only the intervals when Queen Mary and the Commonwealth ruled), there was united with this object—and indeed deemed to be an essential part of it—a determination to uphold the superiority of the Church, as reformed under Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, over other religious systems.

James the Second, upon his accession to the throne, adopted an exactly opposite policy. He had for some years previously avowed his conversion to the Roman Catholic faith, being induced to this course by such deep-rooted convictions as extinguished any consideration of personal advantage, and impelled him to disregard the danger to his succession which might have arisen from the displeasure of the English people, then of decidedly Protestant sentiments and opinions.



James found in Ireland a Protestant ascendancy. He proceeded to substitute a Roman Catholic ascendancy. With this object he appointed Tyrconnell, whose attachment to Rome was as ardent as his own, Lord Lieutenant. Under the rule of this minister the chief departments of the State—the army, the magistracy, and the judicial bench—were remodelled with a view to effect the King's object.

The same ends were pursued by James in England; but there his designs were successfully resisted by the nation, which became completely alienated from him. Ultimately, flying from the kingdom, he was held to have abdicated the throne, and the Crown of England was by the Parliament of that kingdom settled upon his daughter Mary and her husband William, Prince of Orange.

In Ireland the majority of the people were Roman Catholics, predisposed by religious sympathy to regard James with favour. Under Tyrconnell's management the majority thus constituted had gained political power; and, as might be expected, it was not without fear of the consequences in Ireland that they at this time saw the triumph of the Protestant party in England, and the consequent elevation to the throne of a Prince, who, upon the Continent, had been the great champion of Protestant interests. Under such circumstances James, certain of support from his Irish Roman Catholic subjects, determined to assert in Ireland his title to the Crown, and with that object landed (March 12, 1689) at Kinsale, a southern seaport of the island.

The arrival of James in Dublin was followed by the assembling of a Parliament convened by him, which was

composed, with the exception of a few in each House, of persons of his party and religion, who proceeded at once to enact a series of statutes, designed to introduce changes in the social condition of the country, too important and extensive to admit of their being passed by without at least a brief notice in any history of the period, whether ecclesiastical or civil.

By one of the Acts of this Parliament the titles of all the proprietors of landed estates in Ireland, who had come in under the Commonwealth, although confirmed by the Acts of Settlement and Explanation of Charles II., were annulled; and it was enacted that the persons or descendants of the persons who, on the 22nd of October, 1641 (the day before the rebellion of that period commenced), had been entitled to these estates, might enter in and regain possession of them. Of the existing owners who were thus to be dispossessed, only purchasers for a pecuniary consideration were to receive compensation. By another Act, more than two thousand persons who in general were possessed of landed property, and who were all Protestants, were by name attainted and made liable to the penalties of high treason, unless they came in and surrendered for trial before tribunals, which had at that time ceased to command confidence. A third statute withdrew from the clergy of the Established Church the tithes payable by Roman Catholics (which formed far the greater part of their emoluments), without compensating the existing incumbents for the loss of their life estates in them.\*

---

\* The proceedings of Tyrconnell, and subsequently of James's Parliament, are very fully narrated by Macaulay (*History*, vol. iii. chap. xii.). With him, as regards the latter, should be compared Lecky (*History*,

Fortunately, the enactment of this legislation was soon followed by the arrival in Ireland of an army from England, which protected those against whom James's statutes were aimed. Not long afterwards, the English Parliament passed an Act, declaring all the proceedings of the Irish Parliament null and void; and when the war between James and William had terminated in the success of the latter, the Irish Parliament did the same, adding that all records of these proceedings should be destroyed.\*

By William and Mary the Church in Ireland was re-instated in the pre-eminence it enjoyed under Charles II. Some additions even were made to its former possessions, inappropriate tithes forfeited to the Crown by adherents of James being granted to the incumbents of the parishes where they were payable.

Before the abdication of James several bishoprics in Ireland had fallen vacant which he refused to fill. To these, when order had been in some degree restored, William and Mary appointed—the first exercise of their patronage being in the month of December, 1690, by the translation of Narcissus Marsh from the See of Leighlin and Ferns to the Archbishopric of Cashel: a promotion well merited by the zeal and fidelity with which this prelate, until compelled to abandon his diocese and take refuge in England, had discharged the duties of his office.

---

vol. ii. chap. vi. pp. 184-194). The latest account of the period will, however, be found in Dr. Dunbar Ingram's *Two Chapters of Irish History*. In one respect James's Parliament set a good example; at the suggestion of James, it passed a Toleration Act: the object sought seems to have been confiscation, not persecution.

\* 7 William III., chap. 3 (Irish).



It is remarkable that although William and Mary were themselves friendly to the Irish Church, and although in other respects its ancient privileges were revived, Convocation was never summoned in Ireland either by William and Mary, or after the death of the latter by William. The right to tax the clergy, which this assembly had in Ireland exercised under James I., Charles I., and Charles II., was now assumed by Parliament, probably in imitation of what had taken place in England, where, in 1664, authority to tax the clergy had been conceded to Parliament under an arrangement between Archbishop Sheldon and Lord Clarendon, the then Lord Chancellor, the clergy in return receiving or assuming the privilege of voting for members of Parliament.\* Taxation of the Irish clergy by Parliament was opposed by the bishops in the Irish House of Lords, and their protest claiming this power for Convocation was recorded in the journals of that assembly.†

It is probable that the refusal to summon Convocation arose from the supposed attachment of the Irish clergy to the House of Stuart. Like their English brethren, many of them inclined to the doctrine of divine right and indefeasible authority in the King claiming by descent; but they were less ready to become martyrs for the theory; for, while in England, some Bishops, and about four hundred of the clergy, refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, were deprived of their preferments,

---

\* Carwithen's *History of the Church of England*, vol. iii. pp. 106-112.

† See letter of Archbishop King to the Bishop of Worcester, 9th February, 1699, cited by Mant, *History*, vol. ii. p. 100.



and seceding formed the sect of the Non-Jurors, in Ireland very few refused to comply with the law. Among those, however, were two of note, Sheridan, Bishop of Kilmore, and Charles Leslie, Chancellor of the diocese of Connor.\*

Leslie was a theological writer of great ability. He was noted for the acuteness and logical power of his arguments. "Charles Leslie," said Dr. Johnson, emphatically, "is a reasoner, and a reasoner not to be reasoned against"†—a panegyric well deserved, if by no other of his writings, by his treatise entitled, "A Short Method with a Deist." In this, laying down certain tests to distinguish a true history of events, he applies them to the accounts of the institution of the Mosaic and Christian religions. These tests were—(1) that the matters of fact alleged be such as could be judged of by the senses, be seen and heard; (2) that they shall have occurred publicly in the face of the world; (3) that monuments, acts, and observances, in memory of them shall have existence and continue; (4) that these shall have their commencement and institution from the time that the matters are said to have occurred.‡

---

\* Another Non-Juror of celebrity, Henry Dodwell, was an Irishman. He was a layman, and then Camden Professor of History in the University of Oxford; but previously he had been a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. He was noted for his erudition, a chronological work of his being still cited. His theological opinions went beyond those of any other of the High Church party. According to him the immortality of the soul is conveyed in baptism, and its efficacy comes from the bishops through the clergy ordained by them; sacerdotal absolution is necessary for the remission of sins (see his *Epistolary Discourse*). An Irish Bishop, Mills of Waterford, and the eminent Divine, Dr. Clarke, published replies to his writings.

† Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (Croker's edition), vol. v. p. 186, *note*.

‡ Leslie went to the Continent and joined there the Court of the

Under William several measures relating to Irish ecclesiastical affairs became law. Thus statutes were passed for abolishing the writ *de hæretico comburendo* (which as yet continued to be legal in Ireland); for suppressing profane cursing and swearing; for regulating the days to be observed as holy days, and for enforcing the observance of Sunday. The erection of glebe-houses was encouraged by obliging the incumbent who succeeded the builder to repay a portion of the expense of construction, and by enabling him to obtain contribution again from his own successor.\*

The Primate from the accession of William and Mary, until the death of William, was Michael Boyle, previously Bishop of the united dioceses of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross. This prelate was also Lord Chancellor—the last ecclesiastic who in Ireland filled the office. The Court of Chancery was indebted to him for some of the rules which long regulated its procedure. It is characteristic of the mode in which the government of the Church of Ireland was conducted in the seventeenth century, that when Bishop of Cork, Boyle held with the office six parochial benefices; and this continued until his own kinsman, Lord Orrery, when President of Munster, compelled him to resign them.

Another instance of the open violation of the laws of the Church is furnished by the case of Hacket, Bishop

---

Pretender; was allowed to return home again, and died at his own house, Glasslough, in the county of Monaghan, where his descendant, Sir John Leslie, now resides. Charles Leslie was son of John Leslie, Bishop of Raphoe and afterwards of Clogher.

\*The Acts of the Irish Parliament referred to in this paragraph are: 7 Wm. III., ch. 2; 7 Wm. III., ch. 9; 7 Wm. III. ch. 14; 7 Wm. III., ch. 17; 10 Wm. III., ch. 6.

of Down and Connor, deprived in 1694, because of non-residence, simony, and other offences, by a visitatorial commission, issued under the authority of the Crown. He had, during twenty years previously, been tolerated in almost total absence from his diocese without any adequate excuse.

From the time when the sovereignty of William and Mary had been established, the political policy pursued was directed solely to the aggrandizement of the Protestant party. The Parliament which then (1692) was convened met under influences not favourable to a calm and statesmanlike review of affairs. It was composed exclusively of Protestants, of whom many had been excluded from office by Tyrconnell, and more had seen the title to their lands endangered by the legislation of James's Parliament. Animated by resentment, and the pride of victory, they sought only how to assert and keep for themselves the ascendancy which the defeat of James had secured for them, and, that they might the better accomplish that purpose, to render their adversaries incapable of making any resistance. The same spirit continued in the succeeding Parliaments. At the death of William there were upon the statute-book several Acts directed against persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, and particularly against the clergy of that faith. These formed the commencement of the laws which, from their extraordinary severity, were known as emphatically "The Penal Code," and which, as they were not completed until the next reign, will more properly come to be considered in connexion with its events.

Beside the Act annulling the proceedings of James's



Parliament, the English Parliament passed other statutes professing to bind Ireland.\* Some of these related to the Church: one of them abrogated the oath of supremacy which was then prescribed in Ireland and imposed new oaths.† This legislation appears to have been unpopular with the clergy, and being added to the refusal to summon Convocation, and to the taxation of ecclesiastical persons by Parliament, to have created dissatisfaction. Referring to these causes of complaint, and to others which affected the laity more than the clergy, Bishop King, who had been appointed to the See of Derry by William and Mary, states the opinions of the time in the following terms: . . . “These considerations are very afflictive and uneasy to the people of Ireland, and make them sensible that they are not like to be so happy a people as they promised themselves on the Revolution.”‡

If the legislation of the English Parliament, in relation to Ireland, had been confined to the Acts which were passed concerning the Church, it is not probable that the exercise of the power which was thus claimed would have excited much attention from any except those whose interests were directly affected. But civil affairs were also included within its scope, and it was proposed to deal with Irish trade. The woollen manufacture had prospered in Ireland; and its success was prejudicial to the interest of persons engaged in the same business in England. By them it was proposed that English legislation should be used to put down this

---

\* See Note HH of Appendix.

† See 3 William and Mary, ch. 2 (English).

‡ See letter to Bishop of Worcester, already referred to, p. 157, note.



manufacture in Ireland; and one of the measures suggested was, that the export of Irish wool to the Continent should be prohibited. When it was seen that the power asserted by the English Parliament might be used for purposes most injurious to the trade of Ireland, discontent arose, and led to an examination of the precedents and reasons which were alleged in support of the claim.

In 1698 appeared an elaborate discussion of the subject in a treatise entitled, "*The Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated*," written by Molyneux, Member for the University of Dublin in the Irish Parliament, who was then much esteemed both in England and Ireland for his scientific attainments.\* In this the right of the English Parliament to legislate for Ireland was controverted as well upon historical as upon constitutional grounds.

The appearance of Molyneux's work was followed by much excitement both in England and Ireland; but the English Parliament, persisting in its claim to a legislative jurisdiction over Ireland, and the Irish Parliament remaining passive, the excitement gradually died away, and the authority of the former was acquiesced in and generally in practice acknowledged.

---

\* Locke terms Molyneux "that very ingenious and studious promoter of real knowledge, the learned and worthy Mr. Molyneux," and mentions a problem proposed by him to illustrate the degree in which ideas attributed to the sight are acquired from experience.—*Essay on the Human Understanding*, book ii., ch. 9, s. 8.

## CHAPTER XII.

[1702-1714.]

THE reign of Queen Anne in Ireland is associated with the Penal Code, which, as there has been occasion to mention in the preceding chapter, beginning with some statutes passed before King William's death, had, under her rule, its provisions very considerably extended, and its operation enforced with increased efficiency and stringency.

It would not be consistent either with the plan of the present treatise, or with the space which it allows for consideration of political events, to enter into the provisions of the various statutes which constituted this code. Besides, they have obtained so much examination from historians and writers on political subjects that no more than a summary of their effect seems to be needed. It suffices, therefore, to say that the code (which, however, received some additions later in date than Anne's reign) reduced the Roman Catholic part of the people to the lowest point of depression. Under its enactments they were not eligible to be members either of Parliament or of the municipal corporations: they could not vote at elections to return such members; in no official capacity under the Crown were they employed; the only profession open to them was the medical. In land they could

acquire subordinate interests, but not a fee-simple. Such property of this nature as they already possessed was not taken from them, but upon its descent, if the heir or devisee did not conform to Protestantism, the inheritance was subdivided. Neither clergy, nor schoolmasters of their religion, were even tolerated.

Laws of this character were not peculiar to Ireland: similar enactments proceeded at this time from the Parliament of England; and with less excuse, since whatever might be said respecting the danger to the Protestant Constitution as established at the Revolution, which might result from giving Roman Catholics political power in the former country, where they were numerous, no such reason could be assigned in the latter, where they were few. For the same reason, however, the English penal legislation, while more unjustifiable, was less oppressive than the Irish. The former affected a sect, the latter four-fifths of the people.\*

The injustice, and not less the impolicy, of the Penal Code, the obstacles it interposed in the way of social improvement, the interruption to the internal peace of the community and consequent peril of the State caused by its intolerant distinctions of classes, are now universally admitted. It has not been with equal clearness perceived that in Ireland no interest, no

---

\* This was Archbishop Boulter's calculation of the proportion of Roman Catholics in 1731 (see his *Letters*, vol. ii. p. 57). Others, however, at that time thought the estimate should be higher, and there are authorities for a lower. Until a denominational census was taken in Ireland, statements as to the statistics of religious profession cannot be held to rest on a secure basis. The evidence bearing on the question, so far as it relates to the first half of the eighteenth century, is referred to by Lecky, *History*, vol. ii. p. 255.

institution, suffered more from its effects than Protestantism. So long as the provisions of its statutes continued in force, Roman Catholics were divided from the rest of their fellow-countrymen by a legislative barrier: it was intended that they should be as distinct as the Helots from the Spartans. In practice the intention was imperfectly fulfilled, but this was due not to the law, but to the instincts of human nature overcoming the law. Was it to be expected that those who suffered under such legislation should distinguish between its authors and their creed, or fail to regard both with distrust and resentment?

As the progress of Protestantism among the people was at this time obstructed by injudicious enactments, so also was the progress of the Established Church among Protestants by a similar cause. Its members were placed in a position of invidious elevation over Protestant Dissenters. One provision of the laws passed by the Irish Parliament in Anne's reign imposed as a qualification for office or trust under the Crown the obligation of receiving on some Sunday the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the Church of Ireland. Thus, a Presbyterian, or other Protestant Non-conformist, whom conscientious scruples might hinder from participating in this rite, was excluded from official rank and emolument.

The clause which introduced this obligation is said to have been inserted in England by the Privy Council, when the Bill in which it appeared was, in conformity with a provision of the laws then in force,\* sent over

---

\* Under an Act of the Irish Parliament, known from the Deputy under whom it was passed as Poynings' Law, which will be afterwards



for approval.\* Whatever may have been its origin, subsequent efforts to repeal it failed, and it continued in operation until the next century.†

The Peers and Commoners who completed the Penal Code and enacted the Sacramental Test, were all of the Established Church, and professed by these measures to aim at serving its interests, but, in truth, their real object was to secure an ascendancy in the State for themselves and their descendants. Their legislation brought no advantage to the Church. The impropriations, the consequent poverty of many benefices, the frequent unions and pluralities, were left without any attempt to provide a remedy.

One benefit, not large in amount, but, from the use made of the revenue thus acquired, of much service to the Church, was conferred by the Queen herself. Under the existing law, the Crown continued to receive from the clergy the First Fruits and Twentieths, which, as has been mentioned, Henry VIII. and Elizabeth had appropriated.‡ Anne remitted the latter tax altogether, and granted the other to a Board of Trustees, to be applied by them in providing glebes for the incumbents of parishes, and in purchasing impropriations.§

It was in connexion with an application from the Irish Bishops for remission by the Crown of these imposts that Swift first assumed a prominent position in

more fully referred to, a Bill, in order to become law, should be previously approved by the English and Irish Privy Councils.

\* Burnet, *Own Time*, vol. iv. p. 23.

† The Sacramental Test was not by law abolished for either England or Ireland until 1828.

‡ See as to Henry VIII., p. 32, *supra*; as to Elizabeth, p. 69, *supra*.

§ Anne's grant was confirmed by an Act of George the First.

relation to Irish ecclesiastical affairs. To him the advocacy in England of the application was entrusted, and it was to the influence which he soon acquired with Harley and St. John, then the Queen's Ministers, that her bounty in relation to them was due. In the course of his proceedings for the foregoing purposes, he drew up a statement of the condition of the Church as regards its property, which must be deemed, under the circumstances in which it was prepared and used, equivalent to an official communication of the highest authority. It will, therefore, be now quoted: . . . "Hardly one parish," he said, "has any glebe, and the rest very small and scattered, except a few, which seldom have any houses. There are (he continued) in proportion more impropriations in Ireland than in England; which, added to the poverty of the country, makes the livings of very small and uncertain value, so that five or six are often joined to make a revenue of £50 per annum; and these have seldom above one church in repair, the rest being destroyed by frequent wars and other causes. For want of glebes, the clergy are forced to take farms in their own or the neighbouring parishes, and to live at rack rents."\*

The grant of the First Fruits and Twentieths was not the only mode in which Queen Anne manifested her desire to serve the Church in Ireland. Upon her accession she at once (from the same motive) reverted

---

\* Memorial presented to Harley, October 17, 1710 (Swift's *Works*, vol. x. p. 126). In England, however, the poverty of the clergy at this time seems to have been just as great as in Ireland. Burnet says that hundreds of cures in his time had not £20 a-year, and that some thousands had not £50 a-year.—*Own Time*, vol. iv. p. 33.

back to the old usage, discontinued by William, of summoning Convocation along with the Sessional Meeting of Parliament, and licensing it to proceed to business. And she continued this practice during her reign. Accordingly, the Irish Convocation was summoned in 1703, and met several times afterwards until 1714.\*

In 1704 the principal business transacted by Convocation related to the suggestion of means to be used for converting the natives from the Roman Catholic religion, to which they still almost universally adhered. Notwithstanding that more than five centuries had elapsed since the English first acquired dominion over the Irish race, and although they had planted in the country numerous English-speaking colonies, the use of the Irish language among the portion of the people who were of Irish descent continued.† The Lower House of Convocation, considering that, except through the medium of written and oral communication with them in their own language, the desired result could not be accomplished, sent to the Upper House a resolution asserting the expediency

---

\* Mant does not mention any meeting of Convocation so late as 1713 or 1714; but see Bishop Reeves's Paper on Convocation in Ireland, referred to at p. 22 *n. supra*.

† The use of the Irish language is now confined to some districts remote from Dublin. About fifty years ago, its use was very much more extensive, and in Queen Anne's time this was the case in a still greater degree. The tenacity with which it was retained by the natives finds parallels in Wales and the Highlands, where also the people were Celts. It has an equally remarkable parallel in the case of the Galatians, to whom St. Paul addressed his Epistle. Originally a colony from Gaul to Asia Minor, the Galatians were found in the time of Jerome, six centuries after their emigration, to retain in the middle of a Greek population the Celtic language. See Bishop Lightfoot's Introduction to his *Commentary on Galatians*, p. 12.



of employing preachers in the Irish tongue, and requesting the bishops to take into consideration what number of preachers would be required, and how they were to be supported.\*

In 1705 the Lower House was occupied with canons for the reformation and restoration of discipline; the subject, however, received no attention from the Bishops, and the proceedings of the Lower House became inoperative. "There has been a session," says Archbishop King, "without one clause for the good of the Church."

In 1709 and 1711 the question of converting the natives was again before Convocation. On the former occasion the Upper House initiated the consideration of the subject, as a matter of concern to all Protestants and particularly to the clergy; and the Lower House passed resolutions directing the printing of Irish versions of the Bible, and of the English liturgy, and the use of services and the employment of preachers in the Irish tongue.

In 1711, besides entering on the subject of the conversion of the natives, Convocation, having received the royal licence, framed some canons; also it approved of forms of prayer for prisoners and debtors, which were afterwards printed in the Irish editions of the Prayer-book.

In 1705 an attempt was made by the Lower House of Convocation to regain the power of taxing the clergy, and an address to the House of Commons in relation to the subject was prepared; but their proceedings were

---

\* The Resolution is printed in *A History of Attempts to convert the Natives*, by the Rev. John Richardson, Rector of Belturbet, published in London in 1712. In the same tract proceedings of the Convocation in 1709, connected with the conversion of the Irish, will be found.



treated by that House as a contempt, and their actuary committed to the custody of the sergeant-at-arms.\* In the end the claim seems to have been relinquished. No subsidy was voted by the Irish Convocation in Anne's reign, and, as had been the case under William and Mary, and afterwards under William,† the clergy were taxed for the needs of the State by Parliament in common with, and without any distinction as to liability from, the laity.

In 1716 some proceedings were taken towards a meeting of Convocation, but there was no actual meeting. And from that time until the disestablishment of the Irish Church (1869) the Crown never summoned or gave a licence for the assembling of the Irish Convocation. In England, also, a similar policy was, from about the same time, adopted in reference to Convocation, but it was carried out in a somewhat different manner, for the writs to the Bishops for Parliament still retained the clause under which the Convocations were convened, but no licence to proceed to business was issued.‡ For the discontinuance to license the Irish Convocation to meet and the Convocations of York and Canterbury to transact business, the motives were political; originating, it is said, in apprehensions lest in both countries Jacobite sympathies might be manifested by the clergy if the opportunity was afforded to them.

It will be observed that in the Irish Convocation

---

\* See Bishop Reeves's Paper on Convocation, already cited.

† See page 172, *supra*.

‡ Hence the line in the Dunciad: "The Convocation gaped but could not speak." Since 1852 the Convocation of Canterbury, and since 1861 the Convocation of York, have been not only summoned by the Crown with Parliament, but have debated, and transacted business.

under Queen Anne the conversion of the natives from the Roman Catholic religion especially occupied attention; and, accordingly, with this object the dissemination of Irish versions of the Bible was, as we have seen, recommended by the Lower House. Such versions had been previously made and published—of the New Testament in 1603, of the English Prayer-book in 1608, and of the Old Testament in 1685.\*

Although the two first translations received the approbation of James I. (in whose reign they were published), there does not seem to have been any authoritative mandate for their use until 1623, when James, in directions which he gave to Commissioners whom he had appointed to report on the state of Ireland, included a command that “the New Testament and Book of Common Prayer, translated into Irish, should be thereafter frequently used in the parishes of the Irishrie, and that every non-resident (incumbent) there should keep and continue one to read service in the Irish tongue.”†

In taking up the subject of addressing the natives, with a view to their conversion through translations and other writings in their own language, Convocation under Queen Anne was not so much originating a new work, as reviving topics and considerations familiar at a former

---

\* See Note Z of Appendix.

† See p. 19 of Richardson's Tract, referred to at p. 184, *supra*, note. James seems to have been dissatisfied that the Irish language was not more studied in Trinity College.—See Stubbs's *History of the University of Dublin*, p. 58. It was, however, there studied, not only in the Provostship of Bedell, but also of Marsh, 1676–1682; and, under the latter, Irish services were read and Irish services preached in the College Chapel.—Stubbs, p. 115.

period. When the Canons of the Church were framed, some of them provided in certain cases for Irish services. But, unfortunately, at no period was the project received with the zeal it merited, or, indeed, without influential opposition. "I do not find," wrote Archbishop King at this time, "that it is desired by all that the natives should be converted."\* Political reasons—fear that the proposed measures might be followed by local disturbances, and even if they were not, yet that they would tend to perpetuate the separation of the natives from the Anglo-Irish, by keeping alive for the former a distinct language—outweighed with many the sense of religious duty.†

In the end, however, exertions, not inconsiderable, although much less than they ought to have been, were made to further the policy advocated by the Lower House of Convocation. Irish translations of the Scriptures were circulated among the natives, and along with them an Irish translation of the English Prayer-book, and an Irish version of the Church Catechism; the latter being accompanied by an exposition of its teaching, also

---

\* King to Swift, cited by Mant, *History*, vol. ii. p. 230; and see also King to Swift, September 1, 1711, published in Swift's *Works*.

† In 1767, objections were made to the publication of the Bible in Erse or Gaelic, similar to those urged in Archbishop King's time against its publication in Irish. The former were answered in a very able letter from Dr. Johnson. "I did not," he says, "expect to hear that it could be, in an assembly convened for the propagation of Christian knowledge, a question whether any nation, uninstructed in religion, should receive instruction; or whether that instruction should be imparted to them by a translation of the holy books into their own language. If obedience to the will of God be necessary to happiness, and knowledge of His will be necessary to obedience, I know not how he that withholds this knowledge or delays it can be said to love his neighbour as himself."—Croker's *Boswell*, vol. ii. p. 27.



in the Irish tongue. Through some districts, where only the Irish language was spoken, clergymen preached in Irish, and the study of Irish was encouraged among students of Divinity in Trinity College.

Between the Revolution of 1688 and the death of Queen Anne there were many vacancies in bishoprics. The greater number of these occurred before Anne's accession, and were filled by William and Mary, or by William. In 1702, the Primacy became vacant by the death of Boyle, of whom mention has been made in the last preceding chapter. It was conferred upon Narcissus Marsh, Archbishop of Dublin. On his death in 1713, Thomas Lindsay was translated from the See of Raphoe to Armagh. Upon the promotion of Marsh, Bishop King, then of Derry, was translated to Dublin.

Both at Dublin and Armagh Marsh was deservedly estimated highly. Of Lindsay there is little to be said. In a less difficult place he would probably have met general approbation; but he was not thought equal to the duties devolving upon a Primate. He has the merit, however, of munificence to the Church. To him the choir at Armagh Cathedral was indebted for a liberal endowment, which it still possesses.

Archbishop King had in his own day no superior in the Irish Church, either as a Bishop or as a theological author. His writings will be subsequently considered. His conduct in the dioceses which were successively under his government may be now referred to. When he went to Derry, he found the country in great disorder. It had suffered much during the civil war. Tillage had been then neglected, the live-stock destroyed, the buildings dilapidated. Hence the farmers and peasants



were impoverished. Along with the social, the ecclesiastical condition of the diocese decayed; many of the clergy fled; those who remained were poor; most of the churches and glebe-houses (the latter at that time few in number) were out of repair. These evils were met by corresponding exertions on the part of the Bishop—with such success that, upon his removal to Dublin, he transmitted to his successor a diocese which might favourably compare with any other in Ireland.

As Archbishop of Dublin, King displayed similar energy and zeal. Swift, a severe judge of character, described him, a few years after his translation to that office, as spending his time in acts of hospitality and charity, in building churches, repairing his palace, and in introducing and preferring the most worthy persons he could find, without other regards: “in short” (he added), “in the practice of all virtues that could become a public or private life.”\*

With Marsh and King may rightfully be classed Stearne, who, in 1713, was promoted from the Deanery of St. Patrick’s Cathedral to the Bishopric of Clogher. Personally pious, diligent in the discharge of his duties, and singularly generous and charitable, this excellent Prelate was by both laity and clergy regarded with respect and affection.

Unfortunately, King, Marsh, and Stearne must be regarded as exceptions from the usual standard of the

---

\* This character of Archbishop King appeared in the first edition (1708), of Swift’s *Letter from a Member of the House of Commons of Ireland*. In Faulkner’s edition of Swift’s works (Dublin, 1739), the letter is published without the portion relating to King: the preface says, “some passages are omitted, which relate to certain persons, and are of no consequence to the argument.”

Irish Episcopal Bench in their time. Very generally the rest of the Bishops were reproached with apathy and negligence. Many of them were frequently for long periods absent from their dioceses. Thus, in the Province of Armagh—which then comprised more than a third of the Irish bishoprics, and these from the number of Protestants within them the most (if we except Dublin) important—there were, according to Archbishop King, in 1714, only two Bishops resident, and for several years previously there had been but one.\* Attendance on Parliament seems to have been the only excuse offered for such absence; but it can afford little, since Parliament at that time met not oftener than once in two years, and then on each occasion for a very short time.

Before the close of this reign the Penal Code had begun to operate upon the social condition of the people. At the same time, from another cause, there occurred a great change in the ownership of landed property, which completed the depression of the Roman Catholic portion.† The estates of the proprietors of land who followed James had been confiscated by William, and conferred upon the Generals of his army and his personal friends. But the English Parliament annulled his grants, assumed the right to dispose of the forfeited lands, and vested them in trustees, in order that they

---

\* King to Annesley: *Letter*, July 3, 1714. Cited by Mant, *History*, vol. ii. p. 156.

† As early as 1708 Swift looked upon the Roman Catholic interest as inconsiderable. "Their lands (he says) are almost entirely taken from them, and they are rendered incapable of purchasing any more; and for the little that remains, provision is made by the late Act that it will daily crumble away."—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 146.

might be sold. Roman Catholics were disabled from purchasing, and thus all this vast extent of territory came to be assigned exclusively to Protestants.

The result, therefore, of the policy of the period was the establishment in every department of a Protestant ascendancy. The Roman Catholics were not less numerous than they had previously been, but they were dispirited and without leaders. Deprived of the power to acquire landed property, and not allowed to rise in the service of the State, they turned to the pursuits of trade and commerce. Many in this manner became rich; the rest, especially those whose property consisted of land, did not, until about sixty years later, regain social power or influence.

## CHAPTER XIII.

[1714-1760.]

DURING the reigns of the first two kings of the House of Hanover there was not any relaxation of the penal laws. The social system in Ireland retained without alteration the form which it had assumed under William and Anne. None of the legislation of that time can be said to have operated upon the course of ecclesiastical affairs. Protestantism made few converts; and the relative numerical proportions between its denominations continued much as they had previously been. There is, therefore, for a considerable period little in the external history of the Church to detain attention; and its internal state, the sentiments and ideas which influenced its members, and the general condition of society as regards religion, may now properly be brought under examination.

At the commencement of the eighteenth century, both in England and Ireland, the effects of the reaction from Puritanism which accompanied the Restoration were still felt. The licentiousness of manners which prevailed under Charles II. had indeed in some degree passed away, and virtue and morality, then the subject of ridicule, began to be again treated with respect. But still a sceptical spirit, which had arisen about that



time, continued prevalent; and literature and the conversation of the educated classes were largely imbued with irreverence for sacred subjects, and with loose and unsettled notions as to the authority of revealed religion, which took the name of free-thinking.

Among a considerable number opinions of this character reached to a profession of even absolute infidelity, so much so that Bishop Butler in an "Advertisement," which in 1736 he prefixed to his great work, "The Analogy,"\* when describing the existing condition of society, spoke of many then taking for granted that Christianity, having been discovered to be a fiction, was not so much as a subject for inquiry. The majority, however, of those who held sceptical opinions did not go thus far. With them the authority of Christianity was impaired, but not wholly annulled: they did not deny, although they ceased to be impressed with, the sanctions claimed for its precepts; and while the influence of religion over them was weakened, it was not completely destroyed.

Under such circumstances there was, as might be expected, little external demonstration of respect for the Church among the laity, either in England or Ireland, and small attendance upon its observances and services. Indeed, if contemporary opinion be followed, the picture should be drawn with still deeper shade. According to Addison, writing in 1715, in no neighbour-

---

\* Advertisement prefixed to the first edition of the "Analogy" (1736). Compare Berkeley's *Discourse addressed to Magistrates and Men in Authority, occasioned by the enormous Licence and Irreligion of the Times*: published in Dublin, 1736. In this he mentions a society in Dublin for the purpose of "studied, deliberate indignities against the Divine Majesty."

ing state or kingdom was there less appearance of religion than in England.\* According to Archbishop King the generality of men in Ireland cast an ill aspect upon the Church and Churchmen; the faith of religion was weak and the sense of it almost lost.†

If we regard society, in both countries, irrespective of its religious character, and merely with reference to its general standard of opinion, a judgment equally unfavourable must be pronounced. An age of Unbelief is always an age of low aims and objects. The attraction upwards, derived from looking to the divine superintendence and a future state of reward and punishment, is withdrawn: the faith which exalts human nature above human frailty ceases to operate.‡ Motives of interest, the calculations of selfishness, take the place of higher impulses. Accordingly, the history of the period records nothing dignified or ennobling. Manners were unrefined; mental cultivation was restricted to a few; conversation was coarse and indelicate.§ External decorum, not virtue, was the utmost that the most rigid censor required. In every class excessive indulgence in

\* *Freeholder*, No. 37.

† So Archbishop King says in a letter to Bishop Foy. In the same letter he complains "how diligent, in Ireland, some persons of great quality are to propagate irreligion."—*Mant. History*, vol. ii. p. 95.

‡ Bacon supports this line of observation by an illustration from animal nature: . . . "Take (he says) an example of a dog, and mark what a generosity and courage he will put on when he finds himself maintained by a man, who to him is instead of a God, or *melior natura*—which courage is manifestly such as that creature, without that confidence of a better nature than his own, could never attain."—*Essay on Atheism*.

§ Swift, about 1720, speaks of the corruption of morals among the English people.—*Letter to a Young Clergyman*.—*Works*, vol. vi. p. 283.

drink prevailed. In Ireland, especially, the habits of the gentry were convivial to an excess, and were attended very frequently by expense out of proportion to their means of supporting it.

Although the clergy of the English and Irish Established Churches must be exonerated from the allegation of having adopted sceptical opinions, and from charges of vice or positive misconduct, it cannot be said that they were exempt from the influences of the time. They were superior, but generally little superior, to the laity. The greater number had an inadequate appreciation of the charge entrusted to them; they were negligent in the discharge of professional duties, and without zeal or fervour. They compared, it was then thought, unfavourably in these respects with the clergy of other countries: were more remiss in their labours, and less severe in their lives.\* Their sermons seldom rose above commonplaces upon morals.

In the case of the Irish clergy, some circumstances peculiar to their position operated injuriously. Much the larger proportion of them lived surrounded by a population that rejected their ministry; they had consequently no spiritual work to perform beyond reading prayers and preaching to the few Protestants who attended church upon Sunday. The discipline of character, which is supplied by visiting, instructing the young, consoling sickness and suffering, was wholly wanting. The incumbents of the parishes, where, as was generally the

---

\* This is the judgment of Burnet as to the English clergy (*Own Time*, vol. iv. p. 344). He also says: "The main body of our clergy has always appeared dead and lifeless to me; and instead of animating one another, they seem rather to lay one another asleep."—p. 342.



case, the inhabitants were almost all Roman Catholics, were simply country gentlemen of moderate or humble fortune.

A judicious exercise of patronage might have done something to counteract these disadvantages; it might, at least, have supplied a stimulus to study and mental cultivation. But the patronage of the day was administered from very different motives. The bishops (all appointed by the Crown) were chosen, in most instances, with a view to political services already rendered by themselves or those who recommended them, and with the expectation that they should attend in the House of Lords and vote for the measures of the King's ministers, whoever they might be. The general character of prelates so chosen could not be other than secular; and from them a secularism of ideas and habits spread to those who looked up to their example, and depended upon them for promotion.

It is not, however, to be supposed that this low standard of duty and of intellectual attainment was universal among the Irish clergy; noble examples to the contrary there were to be found among them—men blameless in their lives, and diligent in their calling. Some, too, deservedly attained distinction in literature; and among the contributions to the theological and philosophical controversies of the period, none were more valuable than some which came from Irish Divines.

These controversies, so far as they related to religion, referred to subjects different from those which previously engaged attention. Doctrinal tenets or modes of Church government were no longer debated; it was the truth of Christianity which was now assailed. And,



accordingly, with this as the paramount question, the discussions of the time were concerned; either directly, as, for instance, when the truth and authority of the Scriptures were examined; or indirectly, as when the relations which they reveal between the Supreme Being and His creatures were considered, and the moral government of the world was vindicated.

Among the Irish writers who took part in the discussions upon these subjects, Archbishop King (whose administrative ability and excellence of character there has been already occasion to mention) is entitled to a pre-eminent place. His treatise *On the Origin of Evil* and his *Discourse on Predestination* are characterized by thought and reasoning of a high order. They are still always referred to when the topics of which they treat come under examination.

The treatise *On the Origin of Evil* was the first of these publications. It was composed in Latin, and translated into English by Edmund Law, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle. The explanations which it offered of the difficulties proposed to be solved have been censured, upon the ground that they contain speculative propositions not sufficiently restrained by a sense of our finite capacity and limited knowledge. But of what other attempts to reconcile the mystery of the existence of evil with the omnipotence of a Supreme Being of infinite goodness may not the same be said? Surely here, if anywhere, (to use an expression of Hooker) our safest eloquence is our silence.

The sermon on Predestination is wholly free from the faults attributed to the Essay. Indeed, so admirable is its moderation of idea and expression, and so judicious are

its observations upon the limits of our powers, that, as has been remarked by the distinguished Prelate\* who in our own time republished and edited the sermon, it might justly have borne the title of a "Rule for interpreting rightly the Scripture accounts of God." Accordingly, there is no attempt to explain the foreknowledge of contingent events, or by reasoning to reconcile free-will with prescience; the argument aims merely at demonstrating that what seems to us contradictory may have that appearance, not because of anything in its own nature, but because of the imperfection of our faculties and our consequent ignorance.†

Contemporary with King was Peter Browne, Bishop of Cork (1710–1735). He had been Provost of Trinity College, Dublin; and to him it was due that the pursuit of mental philosophy was much encouraged in this institution, and that the writings of Locke, although then condemned at Oxford, were recommended for study. Browne's merits as a writer on metaphysical subjects have been always recognized;‡ he was also a mathema-

---

\* Archbishop Whately. King's sermon, with comments upon it, is now published along with Whately's other works.

† It is perhaps right to note that another Irish prelate (Bramhall), in a work of earlier date than King's, had sought to explain these difficulties. "The readiest way (he says) to reconcile contingency and liberty with the decrees and prescience of God is to subject future contingents to the aspect of God, according to that presentiality which they have in eternity. . . . The knowledge of God comprehends all times in a point"—a view not improbably suggested by the great mediæval theologian, Aquinas, who terms eternity *Nunc Stans*, "an ever-abiding now." See Works of Bramhall in *Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.* vol. iv. pp. 153–190.

‡ Professor Webb terms Browne "the most original and independent of the followers of Locke"—*Isis*, p. 3. Dugald Stewart (*Works*, iii. 389) shows that Browne, on some important points, anticipated Hume and Reid.

tician, and learned in theological studies. He appears to have been extremely effective in the pulpit. It is recorded that having preached before Queen Anne upon the text, "Never man spake like this man," he received from her the praise that the text might justly be applied to himself.\* 'There are preserved pamphlets and a sermon published by Browne in condemnation of drinking to the memory of the dead. These were suggested by a practice which then began, and is not yet altogether discontinued, of giving as a toast, "the glorious, pious, and immortal memory of King William III." Such toasts he considered profane, and not free from disrespect to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The writings of Bishop Browne of most importance are entitled, *The Procedure, Extent, and Limits of the Human Understanding*, published in 1728, and *Things Divine and Supernatural conceived by Analogy with Things Natural and Human*, published in 1733.† In the first he builds on the foundation laid by Locke. Of all our knowledge, both human and divine, he holds that the senses furnish the groundwork. The mind is at first a *tabula rasa*; according to the dogma of the schoolmen, *nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*. The second aims at establishing that when we proceed from the

---

\* Campbell's *Philosophical Survey*, p. 421. After Browne's death two volumes of his sermons were published. (London, 1749.) When Bishop, he diligently promoted the welfare of his diocese.—See Mant, *History*, vol. ii. p. 194.

† Bishop Butler's *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*, was of later date than Browne's treatise. But except in the use of the word "Analogy" on the title-page, there is no resemblance between them. The word itself, however, might have suggested much.



faculties, properties, and operations of our own spirit to the divine and supernatural, we must use merely analogies and resemblances.

Another contemporary of King was Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne (1734–1753), than whom there was no one in his own age the object of more affectionate admiration. This popularity was due partly to the brilliant theories suggested by a genius singularly subtle and original, and partly to the charm of a character shadowed by few imperfections. His excellence has been described by Atterbury—an acute observer, little disposed to unmerited panegyric—in a few pregnant words that need no addition: . . . “So much understanding, so much innocence, such humility, I did not think had been the portion of any but angels, until I saw this gentleman.”

Berkeley had been a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, and was thence promoted to the Deanery of Derry. This office, which was the most lucrative Church preferment (not episcopal) in Ireland, he proposed to resign, and with three of the Fellows of his College, whom he induced to join him, to proceed to Bermuda, and there to found an educational establishment, which might form a centre of civilization for the American savage tribes. He allotted to himself as its President an income of £100 a-year, and to each of the disinterested persons who were to accompany him £40 a-year. His offer of resignation was not accepted by the Crown, but the project was entered upon, and for some years was in operation. It was then abandoned in consequence of the persistent refusal of Walpole to support it. Justly did Swift say of Berkeley, “he is an absolute



philosopher with regard to titles, wealth, and power ; ” \* still more justly might he have described him as something higher and better ; for when did philosophy ever prompt to such sacrifices ?

Berkeley ranks at the head of metaphysical writers not merely in Great Britain and Ireland, but in Europe, during the interval between Locke and the Scotch School. In 1709 he published his *Essay towards a new Theory of Vision*, in which he put forward the doctrine—until lately generally accepted, and still maintained by high authority—that the eye conveys only sensations of colour, and that the perceptions of distance, magnitude, form, are acquired as the result of experience, by substituting impressions really derived from the touch.†

The *Theory of Vision* was followed by the *Principles of Human Knowledge*, unfolding his ideal theory. The world, which seems to be external, exists only in mind ; in his own words, “all the choir of heaven and furniture of earth, all those bodies which compose the mighty frame of the world, have not any subsistence without a mind.” There is nothing actual but spirit : the Divine Spirit, and the finite spirits created by the Divine. Of these speculations it is no exaggeration to say, that without themselves producing conviction, they have exercised a profound influence over the course of modern thought,

---

\* Letter of Swift to Lord Carteret, Sept. 4, 1724.—*Works*, xi. 249.

† A treatise entitled *Sight and Touch* (London, 1864), by Mr. Abbott, one of the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, contains an elaborate argument against Berkeley's theory. At the same time he admits that it was generally accepted. Professor Webb, in his *Isis*, and Mr. Mahaffy, in his introduction to a *Translation of Kuno Fischer's Kant*, take the same side with Mr. Abbott. Mill, Hamilton, Professor Fraser (the recent editor of Berkeley's works), support Berkeley.

not only in Great Britain, but in Germany and France.\*

In 1732 Berkeley published an elaborate answer to the then popular objections to revealed religion. It was entitled *Alciphron, or the Minute Philosopher*,† and consisted of seven dialogues, in which a debate is maintained between two advocates of free-thinking (one representing the notions of intellectual sceptics, and the other those current in fashionable society), and two defenders of the truth of Christianity. In the discussion thus conducted, the whole domain of thought and knowledge, such as it was at that day, and so far as it bore upon the subjects treated, is traversed with extraordinary ingenuity and learning.

The patriotism of Berkeley deserves especial praise. Others there were in his time who thought of the Anglo-Irish; he alone of the whole Irish people. So far as appears, he was the first who asked in reference to Ireland the question whether a scheme for the welfare of a country should not take in all its inhabitants.‡ Nor is this the only matter as to which he was before his age. In the remarkable publication, where he suggested the ideas as to Ireland which have been mentioned, he,

---

\* The Idealism of Berkeley has been recently discussed, and the various modifying or opposing theories enunciated in reference to the subject traced in a series of Essays by Professor Webb, with an acuteness not unworthy of Berkeley himself.—*Isis*, in the University Press Series, Dublin, 1885.

† The name "Minute Philosopher" seems to be derived from a passage in the *de Senectute*, which Berkeley prefixed as a motto. In this, Cicero, having expressed how, if to believe in the immortality of the soul were an error, he preferred to err, adds, *sin mortuus (ut quidam minuti philosophi censent) nihil sentiam: non vereor, ne hunc errorem meum mortui philosophi irrideant.*

‡ See *Querist* (published by Berkeley in 1735), query No. 255. There are several other interrogatories to a like effect.

through the medium of questions—a mode of instruction probably suggested by what he had read in his favourite Plato concerning Socrates—developed his views on other subjects also, and made many admirable suggestions (then novel and little encouraged), designed to promote social and political reforms.

Prior to Berkeley's *Alciphron* had appeared a defence of Christianity against the free-thinkers by Abbadie, Dean of Killaloe (1699-1727). As Berkeley was in some respects the forerunner of Butler and the *Analogy*, so was Abbadie of Paley and the *Evidences*. Unfortunately for his fame in this country, Abbadie's work is in the French language. In a compressed form it touches upon most of the evidential proofs, more fully expanded by subsequent writers—the need of a revelation, exhibited in the corruption of natural religion by Paganism; the superiority of the Judaic views of the Supreme Being over all before known; the succession and relation of Christianity to Judaism; the testimony to its divine origin afforded by prophecy, by the miracles, life, death, and resurrection of its Founder, and by the majestic purity and self-denial of its teaching.\*

William III. desired to confer upon Abbadie the Deanery of the Cathedral of St. Patrick, Dublin; but his

---

\* The Title of Abbadie's work is *Traité de la Vérité de la Religion Chretienne*. It first appeared at Rotterdam, in 1684. It obtained from Mr. Pitt the praise of being the best book upon the subject that he had read. (See Lord Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. iv. p. 84.) It is interesting to note Pitt's opinion, now that evidential proof has fallen into disesteem; and to compare with it another declaration made by him to Wilberforce, in which he stated that (as often happens with apologetical defences) Butler's *Analogy* had raised more doubts in his mind than it answered.—*Life of Wilberforce*, by his Sons, vol. i. p. 95.



defective knowledge of the English language prevented the King's wishes being carried out. The objection was waived as to Killaloe, a remote place, where there were few Protestants. Abbadie was by birth French, and had been minister in a French Church in London, before he became connected with the Irish Church.

A controversy, which cannot be considered to have yet terminated,\* arose out of some statements in the writings of King, Browne, and Berkeley, which we have been considering. In the sermon on Predestination of the first were observations to the effect that we cannot draw inferences as to moral attributes—such as justice, mercy, love—in a Supreme Being from what we know of them in ourselves, any more than we can of his power from what we are able to do: and that as regards their nature, what he termed an analogical knowledge is all that we are capable of in our present state. Berkeley in his *Alciphron* expressed the opinion that such qualities may, by the finite nature, be attributed proportionally to the infinite; and that we can affirm all sorts of perfection which we conceive to exist in a finite spirit to be in God, but without any of the alloy which is to be found in his creatures.† Browne, in his treatise *On Things Divine and Supernatural conceived by Analogy with Things Natural and Human*, answered Berkeley, and maintained that the divine moral attributes differ from human, not merely in degree, but in kind,‡ and that there

---

\* See the note on the "right of the moral faculty to judge of the Divine attributes," appended to the *Sermons on the Efficacy of Prayer*, by Dr. Jellett, late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.

† *Alciphron*, Dial. iv. s. 21.

‡ See page 263 of Browne's book, ed. 1733. Browne's comments on Berkeley exhibit little of the calmness to be expected from a philo-



is only a similitude or correspondency between natural or human knowledge and moral qualities and a divine supernatural knowledge and attributes.

In addition to the characteristics which have been already attributed in this chapter to the period now considered, should be noted the continual development of distinct parties among the clergy and laity of the Church in Ireland, representing, one English, and the other Irish, interests. Their origin in the case of the laity may be dated from the controversy raised by Molyneux, towards the close of the reign of William III., respecting the jurisdiction exercised by the English Parliament to make laws for Ireland.\* Their subsequent growth among the laity was due to events which followed that controversy. In the interval between its commencement and the death of William III. the legislation which Molyneux's treatise was written to avert was enacted, and the English Parliament supplemented laws which it had previously passed to exclude Irish ships from the colonies by a statute prohibiting the exportation of wool or woollen goods from Ireland for any country except England. To the destruction of Irish trade effected by the former was thus added the extinction of a flourish-

---

sopher. Their contemporary, Skelton, author of *Deism revealed*, addressed a *Letter to the authors of the Minute Philosopher and of the Divine Analogy*, in which he sought to reconcile them, and to which he prefixed the motto :—

“Ne tanta animis assuescite bella,  
Neu patriæ validas in viscera vertite vires.”

Skelton was Rector of Templecarne, in the diocese of Clogher, and added to his attainments as a theologian the merit of being a most admirable parish clergyman.

\* See p. 177, *supra*.

ing manufacture, and the consequent general discouragement of manufacturing industry in Ireland. Down to the death of George II. no relaxation of these oppressive statutes had been conceded; and there was consequently not merely no abatement, but a constant increase, of discontent and of combination against the authority which had inflicted them upon the people.

These causes would of themselves alone suffice, even if there were no others, to explain the existence of an Irish party among the clergy, since they necessarily sympathised with the condition and shared the sentiments of the community whereof they formed a portion. But it happened that to the same line of conduct as the laity pursued, grievances of their own also impelled. The patronage of the Crown in the Irish Church was extensive, including all the Bishoprics and all the Deaneries. In its exercise Englishmen were preferred; for the most valuable Sees they were selected; and in this way they not merely carried off the highest prizes open to the clerical profession, but, bringing over with them friends and relations for whom they provided, deprived the working clergy of the promotion to which they were justly entitled in the parochial benefices.\*

---

\* The injurious effect of the neglect of Irish merit in the distribution of patronage is commented upon in a letter (July 3, 1725) from Swift to Lord Carteret, the Lord Lieutenant. . . . "The misfortune (he says) of having bishops perpetually from England, as it must quench the spirit of emulation among us to excel in learning and the study of divinity, so it produces another great discouragement, that those prelates usually draw after them colonies of sons, nephews, cousins, or old college companions, to whom they bestow the best preferments in their gift; and thus the young men, sent into the Church from the University here, have no better prospect than to be curates or small country vicars for life."—*Works*, vol. xi. p. 272.

That the dissatisfaction and resentment of the period found shape and form, that definite propositions were substituted for vague sentiments, was due to Swift. Of an English family, but born and educated in Ireland, he was from the accession of George I. settled in his native country, having been appointed Dean of the Cathedral Church of St. Patrick, Dublin, at the close of Queen Anne's reign. Henceforward devoting himself to the promotion of Irish interests, he, upon the first opportunity, came forward to animate and guide a movement against the policy adopted by the English Government towards Ireland. No man without official position has ever possessed authority such as he at once acquired, nor has any leader of public opinion ever retained authority, when acquired, for a greater length of time. During his life his counsels were accepted with universal reverence by the Irish people, over whom, until his faculties decayed, he possessed an undisputed ascendancy.

Swift's character and the events of his life are subjects more suitable for consideration in a history of the State than a history of the Church. In mere intellectual power he had no superior among his contemporaries; but it was little developed in relation to the studies connected with his profession. He was a statesman in the gown of an ecclesiastic. When urged to employ his literary abilities upon religious subjects, he used, as if conscious of duty neglected, to reply in excuse of himself, "If I would produce a sermon, it turns out a pamphlet."

He did, however, publish some sermons and other writings of a theological character, which well deserve attention. One of the most remarkable of these was a



tract, designed to mediate between the extreme parties which divided the Church of England, entitled "The Sentiments of a Church-of-England-Man with respect to Religion and Government." In this Swift expressed opinions upon the question of Episcopacy which may properly be added to those of other eminent persons who have been cited in the course of the present treatise in connexion with the subject. . . . "A Church-of-England-Man (he observed) hath a true veneration for the scheme established among us of ecclesiastical government; and although he will not determine whether Episcopacy be of divine right, he is sure it is most agreeable to primitive institution: fittest of all others for preserving order and purity, and under its present regulation best calculated for our civil state. He should, therefore, think the abolishment of that order among us would prove a mighty scandal, a corruption to our faith, and manifestly dangerous to our monarchy: nay, he would defend it by arms against all the powers on earth, except our own legislature: in which case he would submit as to a general calamity, a dearth, or a pestilence."

Among the sermons, one preached upon the Doctrine of "the Trinity," and another "On the Difficulty of Knowing One's Self," are the most remarkable. The opening of a discourse against sleeping in church will illustrate the sarcastic spirit which accompanied him even into the pulpit. Having read the passage in the Acts of the Apostles which records how Eutychus, while listening to St. Paul preaching, fell from the window, he proceeded:—"I have chosen these words with desire, if possible, to disturb some part in this audience of half an hour's sleep, for the convenience and exercise whereof



this place (St. Patrick's Cathedral) at this season of the day is very much celebrated. . . . The accident which happened to the young man in the text hath not been sufficient to discourage his successors; but because the preachers now in the world, however they may exceed St. Paul in the art of setting men to sleep, do extremely fall short of him in the working of miracles; therefore, men are become so cautious as to choose more safe and convenient stations and postures for taking their repose without hazard of their persons: and, upon the whole matter, choose rather to trust their destruction to a miracle than their safety."

When engaged in his celebrated controversy respecting Wood's copper coinage, Swift did not hesitate to preach a sermon upon the subject. Anticipating objections to such an use of the pulpit, he referred to the mischievous effects which he anticipated from the project, and observed that "it was time for the pastor to cry out that the wolf was getting into his flock, to warn them to stand together, and all to consult the common safety." The sermon accumulated the motives which ought to induce patriotism, or the love of one's country, alluded to the condition of affairs which at that juncture rendered the practice of this virtue highly necessary, and pointed out that every man's exertions may be of advantage; "for there are few people (he remarked) so weak or mean who have not sometimes in their power to be useful to the public."

## CHAPTER XIV.

[1760-1800.]

THE reign of George III. began in 1760, and continued for sixty years. In 1800 the Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland was passed. This measure brought with it changes of great magnitude in the relations between the two countries, operating as well upon ecclesiastical as civil affairs. Its date will, therefore, form a convenient division in the narrative to be now entered upon, and attention may for the present be confined to occurrences before that event.

For some time previous to the death of George II. a religious spirit developed itself within the Church both in England and Ireland. Necessarily its progress had been gradual; for at first it found a clergy to whom zeal and fervour were distasteful, and a laity apathetic and difficult to move. In both countries it was manifested principally among the humbler classes of society.

The chief agents in producing these results were John Wesley, and a small number who allied themselves with him. They were all members of the Church of England, Wesley himself being a clergyman ordained by one of its bishops. The object sought by their association was to stimulate practical piety among the

people. To promote this purpose they were unwearied in preaching and exhorting. When they had thus gained the adhesion of a sufficient number to their views, they founded a system, designed by the discipline of observances to confirm the habits which their teaching inculcated.

Methodism—as this system came not long after its institution to be called—was not planned in any hostility to the Established Church. Wesley made no objection to the doctrines or formularies of the Church of England; he had no intention of creating a separation from it on the part of his followers. His desire was to proceed not adversely to, but in harmony with, its clergy. The enemy he encountered was irreligion. And this policy during his life he maintained, and endeavoured to induce his followers to adopt. Thus, in 1773, when some Methodists exhibited a tendency to abandon their connexion with the Irish Established Church, he preached against the project at Omagh;\* and two years later, at Bath, he expressed similar sentiments.†

Methodism had many preachers and adherents in England before it was introduced into Ireland. When it was, its missionaries at first excited surprise rather than hostility, and were listened to by the lower orders of all religious denominations. But in a short time opposition arose. The Roman Catholic clergy withdrew their

---

\* Wesley's *Journal: Works*, vol. xvi. p. 106.

† Sermon cxv. *Works*, vol. xvi. p. 267. Shortly before his death, Wesley wrote in his *Journal*:—"I never had any design of separating from the Church. . . . I live and die a member of the Church of England." Wesley's position towards the Church and the position of Wesleyanism generally, are the subject of a very able lecture in Canon Curteis's *Bampton Lectures on Dissent in its relations to the Church*.

flocks. To the Presbyterians Methodism, as taught by Wesley, which was the form presented to them, could not be acceptable, for it was entirely opposed to the standard of faith adopted by their Church upon the questions of Predestination and Election;\* besides it did not agree with them as to Episcopacy. Wesley's disciples in Ireland were therefore recruited from members of the Established Church, and, as its clergy in general disapproved of his organization, almost altogether from the laity. With them its progress was constant and steady; and at the time of the Union it was computed that Methodism numbered in Ireland about 90,000 in connexion with its discipline, beside grown-up children and "stated hearers" of its preachers.†

Great as was the direct effect of Methodism upon the religious condition of society, it is probable that its indirect was not less. Where it did not induce connexion with its associations, it operated by example. Many who refused to enrol themselves among its followers were yet insensibly led to imitate its more strict rule of life. In the clergy of other denominations of religion, it stimulated an emulative zeal; its teachers were rivals, and in order to compete with them at

---

\* A portion of the Methodists under Whitefield held Calvinistic opinions. Wesley always opposed them. His sermon of Free Grace was expressed so strongly that it led to a breach with Whitefield.—See Southey's *Life of Wesley*, ch. xxv.

† This is the calculation of Alexander Knox, who had been Lord Castlereagh's secretary before the Union, and who being in great intimacy with Wesley, and after his death with his followers in Ireland, had peculiar opportunities for investigating the subject.—See letter of Knox to Lord Castlereagh, Feb. 19, 1801, in the *Castlereagh Correspondence*, vol. iv. p. 55.



least a diligent discharge of professional duties was needed.

At the same time, or perhaps somewhat later, there also originated in the English Church another party, which contributed much to the religious impulses of the period. It was subsequently known by the name "Evangelical."\* At first the clerical leaders of this party generally adopted Calvinistic tenets; inculcating, however, at the same time the necessity of habitual piety. Possessing marked ability as preachers, they soon acquired influence, analogous to that possessed by Wesley, but never over equal numbers or to the same degree.† Their doctrines, before the close of the eighteenth century, spread to Ireland, where, as there will be occasion subsequently to point out, they at a later date received extensive support.

Whatever assistance the progress of religion both in England and Ireland derived, after the accession of George III., from the foregoing causes, was aided by a general improvement in the modes of thought and in the manners of society. A higher standard of opinion came to be established, and to keep upon a level with it education advanced in its aims and character. Gradually, increased refinement of sentiment, a deeper respect for virtue, and greater decorum of conduct, were everywhere apparent.

---

\* The names Methodist and Evangelical were given by adversaries of the religious systems they designate, and derisively. So Quakers and indeed most of the names of Christian sects had a similar origin—a strange fact in the history of human nature, since which of these sects is there that has not in its system some elements deserving respect?

† An account of the founders of the Evangelical party in England is contained in Bishop Ryle's *Christian leaders of the last century*.

In no class was amendment more perceptible than in the clergy of the Established Church. Receiving their instruction in the same schools and colleges as the laity, they were affected by the vicissitudes of social progress, receding as it receded, and advancing as it advanced. But it was rather among the younger than the older clergy, the parochial incumbents than the higher dignitaries, that this was the case. Upon the latter, especially upon the Bench of Bishops, the mode in which the royal patronage was exercised continued as it had done under George I. and George II. to operate detrimentally. Political motives alone guided the selection for ecclesiastical appointments by the Crown.

Two prelates of the eighteenth century remarkably illustrate the effect of such a system. One of these, George Stone, held the Archbishopric of Armagh, the highest office in the Irish Church, for eighteen years (1747–1765); the other, Frederick Augustus Hervey, Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, was in possession of the most richly endowed bishopric in Ireland for thirty-five years (1768–1803).

Stone, when appointed to the Primacy, was about forty years of age; yet he had already filled three bishoprics in succession—Ferns and Leighlin, Kildare, and Derry. Of a handsome person, agreeable manners, considerable conversational powers, with industry and ability for business, he was chosen in order that he might assist the Government in the House of Lords, and generally in the conduct of affairs. How he first became connected with the Irish Church (for by birth and education he was an Englishman) does not appear; nor is it certain to what interest he owed his

appointment, in 1732, to the Deanery of Ferns, the first valuable preferment which he received. His brother, Andrew Stone, was in favour with Frederick Prince of Wales, and it has been suggested that by his influence the Primate's advancement was aided. But whatever support he may have obtained in this way, there is no doubt that it would have availed little without the qualities which enabled him to take advantage of any opportunity that opened. Ambitious, energetic, devoting his whole attention to public affairs, he was precisely the person of whom the Irish Government stood in need, and whom, therefore, they preferred to every competitor. Nor, when he gained power, did he disappoint the expectations of those who selected him. In the counsels of successive Irish administrations, in Parliament, with the Protestant public, he soon won, and afterwards during his life retained, an ascendancy which only one man (Boyle, at first Speaker of the House of Commons, and afterwards Earl of Shannon) attempted to rival. Professional merit he neither had nor desired to be supposed to have. "Look on me," he is reported to have said to the English physicians whom he consulted when his health gave way, "not as an ordinary clergyman, or as subject to the diseases of the clerical profession, but as a man who has injured his constitution by sitting up late and rising early to do the business of Government."\*

---

\* Stone and Lord Shannon died within nine days of each other. They were both at the time Lords Justices. (See Hardy's *Life of Charlemont*, vol. i. p. 201.) Not denying that Stone had in some respects political views more just than those generally in favour with his contemporaries, Hardy says, "his own aggrandizement predominated over



The Earl of Bristol was as ill-qualified for his office as Stone. His manners, his ideas, his pursuits, were wholly foreign from the clerical profession. The family of which he was the head was noted for eccentricity; and it used to be said that all the eccentricity of the race was concentrated in him. Possessing, in addition to the large revenues of his bishopric, an ample private fortune, of high rank as a spiritual, and higher as a lay Peer, he was discontented unless he could also acquire popularity and political power. Accordingly, he resolved to convert all the advantages of his station and wealth into means towards this end. When the Convention of Volunteers assembled with the object of assisting the national Party in Parliament—then demanding reform in the parliamentary representation—the Bishop caused himself to be returned from Derry as a delegate to attend it; and, surrounded by a troop of light cavalry, raised at his own expense by his nephew, the unfortunate George Robert Fitzgerald,\* proceeded to Dublin. Thus surrounded, this singular representative of Irish prelacy was received along the road everywhere with military honours. Upon his arrival he was met by a troop of Volunteers, with whom, in addition to his own escort, he went in state through the city, until he reached the place where the Convention was assembled. In that body he then took his seat, and was for some time among its most prominent leaders. He afterwards

---

every other consideration.” The anecdote of his conversation with his physicians is told in Campbell’s *Survey of the South of Ireland* (London: 1778), p. 55.

\* George Robert Fitzgerald, a noted duellist, was executed for murder at Castlebar in 1786.



went abroad, and spent the last years of his life in Italy.\*

If the characters of other Irish bishops selected, like Stone and Lord Bristol, from inducements of a political nature, are examined, it will be found that worldliness altogether predominated. Their ideas and habits were not such as became ecclesiastics. Of some in Swift's time, if his representations were to be followed implicitly, still stronger censure ought to be expressed; but descriptions of his contemporaries, whether lay or clerical, by this great satirist, must be read with caution; he is seldom fair in speaking of his political opponents, or of those patronised by them.† The bishops whom he condemned owed their appointments to the Whig party, against whom, from the time he joined Harley and St. John until his death, he maintained a perpetual and bitter controversy. They had, also, many of them been English clergymen; and Swift, at the head of the Irish

\* See as to Lord Bristol, Hardy's *Life of Charlemont*, vol. ii. p. 102; Sir Jonah Barrington's *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation*; Mant, *History*, vol. ii. pp. 668-696. A writer in the *Quarterly Review* (vol. lxxxii. p. 514), in a review of Mr. Croker's edition of Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, alludes to the bishop as "the celebrated 'Comte-Evêque' of the Continent. His eccentricities had procured for him (*notus nimis omnibus*) the same unbecoming celebrity upon the Continent that they had at home.

† The sarcastic description of the English portion of the Irish Episcopal Bench, attributed to Swift (I do not know on what authority originally), is too often cited, as if it were serious. The persons selected were (he says) good and excellent; but "as the worthy divines crossed Hounslow Heath, on their way to Ireland, they have been regularly robbed and murdered by the highwaymen frequenting that Common, who seized their robes and patents, came over to Ireland, and were consecrated bishops in their stead."

interest and Irish party, made the preference of Englishmen for the great offices of Church and State in Ireland the object of his most severe censure.

One of the complaints very frequently made as to both bishops and clergy in Ireland in the eighteenth century was non-residence. To this several causes contributed. Many parishes had no glebe-houses, and houses suitable for the incumbents were not to be procured. Another cause was, that from the poverty of the separate parishes several were often united together, and of course there could be a resident rector only in one of them. Englishmen, whether bishops, or in possession of benefices conferred upon them either by the Crown or by the Englishmen who were bishops, seldom were content to reside in remote districts, and sought excuses for absence.

The proceedings of the Irish Parliament for about thirty years before the end of the eighteenth century were of extreme importance. Much of the Penal Code was repealed or relaxed. A policy of justice towards the Roman Catholic portion of the people began to be favoured. So far indirect benefit accrued to the Church from the legislation of the time, but direct consideration of its interests there was none. Yet never was it more needed. To the impoverishment of the parochial endowments caused by the impropriations had been added that the clergy were deprived of the tithe of agistment (*i. e.* that paid in respect of lands kept for pasture), which, condemned by a resolution of the Irish House of Commons in 1735, could no longer be enforced. The mode, too, in which the tithe that continued to be paid was collected brought on the incumbents at once odium and loss.

Levied in kind by means of unscrupulous agents, the payer was oppressed, and the owner defrauded.\*

Consideration of the greatest and the last political measure of the period we are now concerned with—the Act of Union—being reserved for another chapter, an opportunity is presented for adverting to the ecclesiastical persons most distinguished in the Irish Church within the first forty years after the accession of George III., as well as also to such others of eminence in the previous reign as have been left unnoticed.

Among the latter, Boulter, Archbishop of Armagh from 1724 to 1742, is the most conspicuous. He was earlier in date than Stone and Lord Bristol; but, like them, owed his elevation to political motives. He had been Bishop of Bristol; and was thence sent to Ireland because capacity for affairs and firmness of character were supposed to fit him for protecting the English interest. On his arrival he at once became the head of the party which in Parliament and the country took the side of the Government, and both in civil and ecclesiastical affairs was its guide. His policy, however, never rose above conferring every office in Church and State upon an Englishman. His correspondence with the English Ministers was, after his death, published, and exhibits the pertinacity with which, whenever a vacancy either upon the judicial or the episcopal Bench occurred, he

---

\* The clergy were generally glad to compound with the tithe-proctors (as those who collected the tithes were called) for much less than the rightful amount: the proctors made as much more as they could. "There are not (says Swift) ten clergymen reputed to possess a parish of £100 a-year, who for some years past have received £60, and that with the utmost difficulty and vexation."—Swift's *Works*, vol. viii. p. 419.



pressed that an Englishman should be chosen to fill it. He seems to have thought that if Irishmen were trusted,\* the authority of the British Crown in Ireland could not be long maintained. This prejudice detracts from Boulter's fame; in other respects, especially in the government of his diocese, and his measures for the Church, he is admitted, even by those who disliked his politics, to deserve approbation. He was, during his life, most liberal in gifts for charitable purposes; and at his death he bequeathed his fortune to provide glebes where they were wanted, or to endow poor parishes.

Robinson, created in 1777 Lord Rokeby, Archbishop of Armagh (1765–1794), is another Englishman whose merits deserve acknowledgment. To great administrative capacity he added a noble munificence, and unwearied zeal for the interests of the Church. He found the diocese of Armagh (as might be expected, since Stone was his predecessor) in disorder. Before his death, churches built and repaired, numerous new glebe-houses, a house and demesne constructed for the See, manifested the energy of his rule. Nor was his zeal for the public good confined to ecclesiastical affairs. He made extensive improvements in the city of Armagh; erected there an infirmary, a public library, an astro-

---

\* See in the published correspondence of Boulter letters to the Duke of Newcastle, dated 19th January, 1724, 1st May, 1725, 3rd December, 1st January, 16th January, 9th February, 18th February, 1726 (O.S.); also letter to Duke of Dorset, 17th August, 1730. In one to the Duke of Newcastle, 4th March, 1724, he says—"If I be not allowed to form proper dependencies here to balance all the present Dublin faction on the Bench (of Bishops), it will be impossible for me to serve His Majesty in my present capacity."



nomical Observatory,\* and provided for the maintenance of the two latter by endowments which were his gift.

Boulter and Robinson, and indeed the Irish episcopal Bench of their times generally, have been censured for not rising above the political ideas of the periods during which they were in office. But ecclesiastics may be excused, until it is shown that the statesmen, their contemporaries, exhibited any superior degree of enlightenment. One, however, of the Bishops, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, warmly supported measures then promoted for relief of the Roman Catholic part of the people. The prelate referred to is John Law, Bishop of Clonfert (1782-1787), of Killala (1787-1795), and of Elphin (1795-1810).

Law was son of the Bishop of Carlisle, who translated and edited King's *Origin of Evil*.† He had been a Fellow of one of the Cambridge Colleges, and had obtained previously high academic distinction. He was at Cambridge the friend of Paley, and on many subjects coincided with the opinions of this admirable writer. The chapter in Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy* upon reverencing the Deity, certainly not inferior to the rest, has been attributed to Law. Before he was moved to Ireland he filled the office of Archdeacon of Carlisle,

---

\* Grattan, in a speech on the Tithe Question, 8th May, 1789 (see *Life*, by his son, vol. iii. p. 409), exempted Robinson, and Bourke Archbishop of Tuam, from his censures of the Bishops. Of the former he said: . . . "He has the first episcopal dignity in this realm; it is his right: he takes it by virtue of the commanding benevolence of his mind, in right of a superior and exalted nature." The latter he described as "mild, pious, and benevolent—a friend to the meekness of the Gospel and a friend to men."

† See p. 197, *supra*.

and while in that office he obtained the character "of great variety of knowledge, uncommon genius, and sincere religion."\*

The sermon at Law's consecration, which took place in the Castle Chapel, Dublin, was preached by Paley. It is remarkable for the view taken of the questions connected with the government of the Church. According to Paley, "whilst the benefits of Christian morality and the fundamental articles of the faith are, for the most part, precise and absolute; are of perpetual, universal, and immutable obligation; the laws which respect the discipline, instruction, and government of the community are delivered in terms so general and indefinite, as to admit of an application adapted to the mutable condition and varying exigencies of the Christian Church." Episcopacy, he held, was recommended for adoption by a variety of considerations; among these in England was its adaptation to the social organization with which it came in contact.†

Law seems to have had many ideas in common with

\* See in reference to Law, Mant, *History*, vol. ii. pp. 685-686, and Croker's *Boswell*, vol. iv. p. 294.

† Paley's sermon was a revival of the ideas put forward, if not favoured, in the earlier part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. In answering objections then made to the Episcopal system, it was defended, upon the lower ground that it was lawful; that the Church or the State (Church and State being then regarded as the same body under different aspects) might lawfully ordain it. But from about fourteen years before the Queen's death a higher tone had been adopted, such as is to be found in Downham's Sermon referred to at page 118, *supra*, and in Jeremy Taylor's Sermon referred to at page 158, *supra*. The progress of opinion is well traced in Canon Perry's *History of the English Church*, 2nd ser., pp. 342-351. With Paley's Sermon may be compared the observations of Lord Bacon, cited at page 119, *supra*, note.

his great contemporary, Edmund Burke, respecting the relation of the State and of the Established Church to members of the Church of Rome in Ireland. At Killala he found that almost all the people belonged to the latter Church. Considering their conversion to Protestantism hopeless, he sought, as he expressed himself, to make them good Catholics; and with a view to their instruction caused the writings of Gother, a Roman Catholic Divine, designed to inculcate piety and morality, to be at his own expense printed and distributed.\*

In a like spirit in 1793, when the Bill for relieving the Roman Catholics from disabilities and restrictions under which they suffered, and for admitting them to the parliamentary franchise, was before the House of Lords, Law expressed himself in the following words: . . . "I look upon my Roman Catholic brethren as fellow-subjects and fellow-Christians, as believers in the same God, and partners in the same redemption.† Speculative differences in some points of faith with me are of no account. They and I have but one religion—the religion of Christianity. Therefore, as children of the same Father, as travellers in the same road, and seekers of the same salvation, why not love each other as brethren? It is no part of Protestantism to persecute Catholics; and without justice to the Catholics there can

---

\* Mant (citing Nichols), *History*, vol. ii. 685-686.

† Compare Bishop Berkeley in his *Word to the Wise*. Addressing the Roman Catholic clergy, he says: . . . "I consider you as my countrymen, as my fellow-subjects, as professing belief in the same Christ. And I do most sincerely wish there was no other contest between us but who shall most completely practice the precepts of Him by whose name we are called, and whose disciples we all profess to be."



be no security for the Protestant Establishment: as a friend, therefore, to the permanency of the Establishment, to the prosperity of the country, and to the justice due to my Catholic brethren, I shall cheerfully give my vote that the Bill be committed.”\*

There was also another of the Bishops sent from England, but earlier in the eighteenth century, who obtained considerable celebrity—Rundle, Bishop of Derry (1735–1743). He was unquestionably a person of ability and attainments. He is said to have excelled in conversation, but with such “vivacity of wit,” as carried him into indiscreet expressions. It was at one time intended to confer upon him an English bishopric, but he was put aside on account of objections raised to his orthodoxy. Under such circumstances his appointment was at first unpopular in Ireland; but in a short time the dissatisfaction was overcome by his manners and conduct; and, according to Swift’s description, he was “esteemed as a person of learning, conversation, and humanity, and beloved by all people.”†

---

\* *Debates in the Parliament of Ireland for the Session 1793*: Dublin, 1793. Bishop Dickson (Down) also advocated a policy favourable to the Roman Catholic claims. See Froude, *English in Ireland*, vol. iii. p. 294; Mant, *History*, vol. ii. p. 760.

† Swift to Pope, Feb. 27, 1736; see also *Life of Archbishop Secker* cited by Mant, *History*, vol. ii. p. 538. “What do you say,” writes Pulteney to Swift, “to the bustle made here to prevent the man (Rundle) from being an English bishop, and afterwards allowing him to be good Christian enough for an Irish one?”—Swift’s *Works*, vol. xiii. p. 160.

Swift and Pope were both on Rundle’s side. The former contrasted Rundle with the other Irish bishops, of whom he wrote with bitter sarcasm (*Works*, vol. xvii. p. 178):—

“Rundle a bishop! well he may,  
He’s still a Christian, more than they.  
We know the subject of their quarrels;  
The man has learning, sense, and morals.”



Percy, Bishop of Dromore (1782-1811), had, while Dean of Carlisle, been one of the brilliant circle which gathered round Johnson. His collection of ancient English poetry exercised much influence upon the character of poetical literature in the nineteenth century. Percy, when a bishop, is said to have been revered for his piety and benevolence.\*

Not many of the bishops of Irish birth who during this reign were before the Union appointed to the Episcopal Bench were eminent. The most distinguished of them seems to have been O'Beirne, appointed to the See of Ossory in 1795, and promoted to Meath in 1798. This prelate was originally a Roman Catholic; and it is related that while he rose to eminence in the Protestant Church his brother was about the same time advanced in the Roman Catholic. He was noted for attention to the discipline of his clergy, and especially for his efforts to repress the evil of non-residence. In one of his charges, having pointed out the example of the Roman Catholic clergy, who (he says) all lived among their flocks, and were in familiar intercourse with them, he urged, that "if we hope to succeed in our good cause, we must come down to an emulation of their exertions: an emulation

---

Pope selected four bishops for panegyric, and Rundle was one of them:—

"Even in a bishop I can spy desert:  
Secker is decent; Rundle has a heart.  
Manners, with candour, are to Benson given;  
To Berkeley every virtue under heaven."

It will be observed that of the four bishops two were on the Irish Bench.

\* Johnson said of Percy that he never went out of his company without having learned something. According to Boswell, he was "heir-male of the ancient Percies."—Croker's *Boswell*, vol. iv. pp. 127, 134.

not of envy and strife; not of angry controversy or disputation; not of any intemperance of proselytism, where the idle contest is merely to swell the number of nominal votaries, without making better Christians or better subjects, and with the continual breach of Christian charity and benevolence; but an emulation in the discharge of such pastoral duties as are most calculated to secure us the respect and the attachment of our flocks."

Hamilton, at first Bishop of Clonfert (1796-1799), and afterwards of Ossory (1799-1806), and Matthew Young, Bishop of Clonfert (1799-1800), had been Fellows of Trinity College, and were distinguished for mathematical attainments. They were both esteemed for conscientious attention to their official duties. Young has received in every capacity no ordinary praise, being described as combining with his scientific powers other intellectual endowments, and a character irresistibly engaging.\*

With the close of the century a change in the style of preaching began to be perceptible. Sermons had previously been essays on morality, or explanations of doctrinal questions. That they became something more was due to Kirwan, Dean of Killala. He came (exclaimed another great orator†) to interrupt the repose of the pulpit; and from the time of his appearance a tendency to appeal to the emotions as well as the

---

\* See as to Young, Mant's *History*, vol. ii. pp. 743-5.

† Grattan (Speech in the House of Commons, January 17, 1792). It was in speaking of Kirwan, and the inadequate preferment conferred upon him, that Grattan used the expression so often since applied with little appropriateness: . . . "The curse of Swift was upon him: to have been an Irishman and a man of genius, and to have used it for the good of his country."

reason may be dated. His eloquence, if judged by its effects, its power to touch the heart, and impel to acts of generosity and benevolence, has not been since equalled; but, as is also the case with Whitefield, an orator of extraordinary persuasiveness, no record of Kirwan's preaching which has been preserved is worthy of his contemporary reputation. His manner was modelled upon the examples of Bossuet, Massillon, and other great French preachers. To the study of their oratory he was probably directed by the circumstance that his education was in a Jesuit College at St. Omer.

Kirwan had been ordained a Roman Catholic clergyman before he joined the Established Church in Ireland. In taking this step it seems that he was somewhat influenced by the idea that thereby a more extended field of usefulness, and one for which he was fitted, would be opened to him. In his sermons he studiously avoided controversial topics.

It is little to the credit of the dispensers in his time of ecclesiastical patronage in Ireland that no better preferment could be found for this brilliant ornament of the Irish Church than one of its poorest deaneries. More sense of his merits was shown after his death, when his widow received from the King a liberal pension.

From 1795 to 1800 Newcome was Primate. He was translated from the bishopric of Waterford and Lismore. It is said that in his appointment public utility alone was considered, and that it was "his unassuming virtue, conduct, principles, and erudition which recommended him for the office."\*

---

\* Lord Charlemont. See Hardy's *Life of Charlemont*, vol. ii. p. 224.

## CHAPTER XV.

### THE UNION.

IN the year 1800, the Union of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland and of the Churches of England and Ireland was enacted by the Parliaments of the two countries. The supreme importance of a measure of this character justly claims a notice not merely of its provisions but of the events which led to its adoption.

In 1707 an Union of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland was effected. Their separate existence was merged in one United Kingdom under the name of Great Britain, with the same Crown, and with one Parliament composed of Peers and Commoners from all parts of Great Britain.

Before this Union, as we have seen, the English Parliament claimed the right to legislate for Ireland.\* After it came into force the British Parliament asserted the same authority: and with a view to place the matter beyond dispute passed a statute—known as the Sixth of George the First—which declared that Ireland hath been, is, and of right ought to be, subordinate unto, and dependent upon, the Imperial Crown of Great Britain, as being inseparably united and annexed thereto; and

---

\* See page 176, *supra*.



that the King's Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament, had, and of right ought to have, full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the kingdom and people of Ireland.

The power asserted for the British Parliament by this Act was a restraining force in reserve, which the English Government could call into action to control the Irish Parliament; but there was in operation at the same time another law, which more immediately and constantly produced a similar result. By a statute passed in Ireland in the reign of Henry VII., known as Poynings' Law from the Deputy under whose rule it was enacted, it was provided that before a Parliament might be held in Ireland the Chief Governor and Council were to notify to the King the causes and considerations for it, and all such Acts as it seemed to them should pass; that such causes, considerations, and Acts should be affirmed by the King and his Council in England to be good and expedient; and that the King's licence thereupon, as well in affirmation of the said causes and Acts as to summon the said Parliament, should be obtained under the Great Seal of England. An amending Act of Philip and Mary empowered the Chief Governor and Council in Ireland, if events necessary to be provided for should happen during a session of Parliament, to certify to the King such other causes and provisions as they might think good: which, if returned approved by the English Council, could then be enacted. The latter statute expressly provided that no other Acts, except those transmitted back from

England, either before or during the Session of Parliament, were to become law.

The Act of George I. gave rise to a renewal of the agitation against the legislative capacity of the British Parliament in Ireland, which, after the publication of Molyneux's treatise, had disturbed the last years of William's reign.\* Its renewal was due to Swift, who took advantage of the popular excitement consequent upon the issue in Ireland of a copper coinage alleged to be debased, under the authority of a patent granted to an English ironmonger named Wood, to awaken general discontent with the predominance of the British Parliament. Molyneux, he said, had opposed the like assumption of authority on the part of England, "as far as truth, reason, and justice were capable of opposing"; but against his opposition "the love and torrent of power prevailed."

From the age of Swift a spirit of nationality pervaded public opinion in Ireland, but, until about the middle of the eighteenth century, with little effect or external manifestation. Then a movement commenced, excited by the depressed condition to which Irish trade and manufactures had been reduced by laws of the English Parliament in reference to these subjects, and drew in its train a revived examination of the legislative jurisdiction assumed by the British Parliament over Ireland.

At the time when Irish society began to be generally operated upon by these influences (A.D. 1760), there occurred a dissolution of Parliament, caused by

---

\* See page 177, *supra*.

the death of George II. The general election which followed, not only brought the old members of the House of Commons in contact with their constituencies, but also led to the election of many new members; and by these means popular ideas and sentiments came to be reflected within this assembly to a much greater degree than was the case in the preceding Parliament, which sat for the long period of thirty-three years.

For some time before the Dissolution a political party, professing to be animated by patriotic sentiments, zealous for the promotion of Irish interests, had been formed in the House of Commons. It now acquired, and henceforward continued to retain, importance, by reason not merely of additions to its number, but of the superior ability and capacity for affairs of those who came forward to advocate its cause. Before twenty years had elapsed its influence affected the tone of debate in Parliament, and materially contributed to modify legislative action.

In 1778 the Parliamentary patriotic party received a great accession of strength. They obtained allies, with whose aid they could no longer be resisted. Volunteers for the defence of the kingdom were at that time embodied. Enlisted from all classes and all parts of the country, this force was imbued with the ideas then popular, and quickly manifested sympathy with the friends of national interests in the House of Commons.

The immediate result of this alliance was seen in concessions by the Government upon commercial questions. Statutes hindering or imposing restrictions on the export of wool, woollen goods, and glass from Ireland were repealed. Regulations prohibiting direct trade



with the Colonies were abandoned; and it was enacted by the British Parliament that there should be free export and import to and from Ireland with the West Indies and with the British Settlements and Colonies in America and Africa—subject only to such duties being levied in Irish ports as were or might be levied in British.

Successful in their demands for the liberation of trade, the Irish Parliament and the Volunteers proceeded to insist upon the independence of the national Parliament. So long as it was controlled by Poynings' Law and the Act of the Sixth of George the First, that Assembly occupied, they asserted, a subordinate and inferior position. Contrasting its depressed state with the liberty and unlimited jurisdiction of the British Parliament, they proclaimed their determination to persevere until all these hindrances to legislative freedom were removed. Ireland was a kingdom; such restraints, they complained, reduced it to the rank of a province.

In 1782 the British Government and the British Parliament yielded what the Irish Parliament and the Volunteers required from them. At once the Act of the Sixth of George the First was repealed. In the next year its repeal was followed by a statute explicitly declaring that the right claimed by the people of Ireland to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of Ireland had been established for ever. Contemporaneously with these statutes an Act of the Irish Parliament abolished the restrictions of Poynings' Law, and provided in lieu of them that a Bill in order to become an Act of the Irish



Parliament, should previously have been returned from England under the Great Seal of Great Britain.\*

In the new constitution framed by these measures, the necessity of approval under the Great Seal of Great Britain for Acts of the Irish Parliament, formed the only restraint upon the legislation of that Parliament. This check, which when applicable was weak in itself, left the whole region of discussion, of declaration of policy, of subsidy, whatever could without a statute be dealt with, open and unfettered. Many subjects of imperial interest there were which must necessarily be submitted to both the Irish and British Parliaments; and for the case of their disagreement no provision was made. The Irish Parliament might refuse to support the foreign policy adopted in England, might have commercial regulations not only differing from English views, but injurious to English interests. If constitutional questions arose there was nothing to prevent its decisions conflicting with those pronounced upon them by the British Parliament.

The omission to provide for solution of difficulties, such as the power of independent action possessed by the British and Irish Parliaments might create, led to important consequences. In 1785 and 1788 these assemblies disagreed and came in direct collision: upon the first occasion in reference to resolutions designed to regulate the commercial relations between Great Britain and Ireland; and upon the second occasion in reference to the rights and authority of the Prince of Wales, in the event (which then happened) of the King's mental

---

\* See the three statutes, 22 George III. chap. 51 (English); 23 George III. ch. 28 (English); and 21 & 22 George III. ch. 47 (Irish).

infirmity disabling him from discharging the duties of a Sovereign.

That these disagreements were of a serious nature was obvious. Still they were only respecting internal affairs; they could not imperil the safety of the Empire. But what if dissension extended further? If it were to reach the relations of the Crown with foreign kingdoms, the maintenance of the army or the navy? Great Britain was then involved in war with France: the Irish Parliament had in its power to dissent from the policy of the King's Government, and by withholding troops and supplies to weaken the resources of the Empire.

Considerations of this character gradually induced a conviction in the minds of English statesmen that some change was needed in the legislative system operative in Ireland; and this conviction was strengthened by observing that even as to affairs exclusively Irish there were disadvantages attending separation of the Parliaments. The views of a local assembly were necessarily bounded by local interests and obscured by local passions and prejudices.

Assuming, then, that there was to be change, what direction ought it to take? Were they to revert to the system of subordination under which the Irish Parliament had existed previous to 1782? Subordination had been, at that time, condemned by the unanimous voices of the Irish people, and abandoned, as unjust, by the equally unanimous voices of English statesmen. Injurious to the interests of Ireland, it was pronounced unworthy the liberality of Great Britain.\* A policy so

---

\* These were Pitt's words when speaking, in 1799, of the system which he said, before 1782, held the two countries together (*Collected*

decisively and so recently repudiated could not be revived. No one ventured to expect that either in the Irish House of Lords or the Irish House of Commons it would find any support.

When restraint could not be imposed upon the Irish Parliament, there remained, in order to escape from the dangers accompanying the existing arrangements between the two kingdoms, only one other course. The Legislatures of Great Britain and Ireland might be fused together; and one United Parliament would then take the place of a Parliament for Great Britain and a Parliament for Ireland. Thus unity of counsel and unity of action, with consequent consolidation of the national resources, would be ensured; while at the same time any local dissensions and jealousies which obstructed social progress might be expected to give place to the nobler aims and impulses originating from a more enlarged sphere and higher motives of action.

Conducted by these reflections to a decision in favour of uniting the kingdoms and Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland, the Ministers of that time had to consider what course was to be pursued in reference to the English and Irish Established Churches. With the same Crown supreme in both, and having each an Episcopal constitution, while their doctrine and discipline were identical, these Churches were yet separate and distinct; nor was there anything in the intended Union which would of itself prevent their remaining as they were. But analogy and example avail much in politics. If the Parliaments of the two kingdoms were made one,

---

*Speeches*, vol. iii. p. 368). See, also, Fox's speech when, as Secretary of State, he brought forward the repeal of the Sixth of George I.



what, with such relations between the Legislatures, hindered that the Church of England and the Church of Ireland should be made one? Moreover, those who prepared the measures requisite to carry out the intended Union, desired to strengthen the position of the Irish Church, not merely in order to conciliate support in the Irish Parliament, but from attachment to the Church itself. Union of the kingdoms without union of the Churches would have left the Church of Ireland standing alone—the Church of a proportionally small minority, surrounded by many enemies, and supported by few friends outside its own congregations. If made part of an United Church, whose members constituted a majority of the aggregate population of England and Ireland, obviously the Church of Ireland would rest upon a wider and more secure foundation.

These reasons operated not merely with the English Cabinet, but also with the Irish bishops, and induced nearly all the latter to support the union of the Churches of England and Ireland. One, indeed, of the most able of them, Bishop O'Beirne, advocated more than mere union; he thought that there ought to be but one Church, and that both in England and in Ireland this should be the Church of England, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as Primate.\*

When the Union of Great Britain and Ireland, and of their Parliaments and Churches, was determined upon, a Bill to carry it into effect was introduced in the Legislatures of each country; and finally both Bills became law. Statutes of the two Parliaments embodied

---

\* See Memorandum by the Bishop of Meath. — *Castlereagh Correspondence*, vol. iii. p. 2.

the agreement between the kingdoms; of which, for the purpose of this treatise, it is only necessary to state the following particulars:—The kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland were, on and after the 1st of January, 1801, to be for ever united into one kingdom by the name of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; for this United Kingdom there was to be one and the same Parliament; four Lords Spiritual, entitled according to a prescribed rotation, and twenty-eight other Lords elected by the Temporal Peers, were to represent Ireland in the House of Lords of the United Parliament; and a hundred members were to be returned to the House of Commons. And as there was to be one United Kingdom, so there was to be one United Church, whose doctrine, worship, discipline, and government should be, and should remain, in full force for ever, as the same were then by law established for the Church of England. It was also declared that “the continuance and preservation of the said United Church, as the Established Church of England and Ireland, was to be deemed, and taken to be, an essential and fundamental part of the Union.”

There was originally in the draft of the Bill a clause referring to Convocation, and making provision for the Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Clergy of the several provinces in England and Ireland being summoned whenever His Majesty should convene a Convocation of the Clergy; but the clause, being thought unnecessary, and likely to raise objections, was ultimately omitted, and no mention whatever was made of Convocation.\*

---

\* See letter of Lord Auckland to Lord Castlereagh in the *Castlereagh Correspondence*, vol. iii. pp. 294–5.

Except in one particular the union of the English and Irish Churches did not affect their distinct rights. The exception was in the case of the Church of Ireland, which previously might have had its own independent formularies, of which the Articles of 1616 and the Canons of 1634 were examples, but which thenceforward was to have the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Church of England.

Neither in England nor Ireland was any Convocation or Synod summoned to consider the union of the English and Irish Churches, or the provisions connected with their union which were contained in the enactments of the British and Irish Parliaments. These rested solely on the authority of the two Legislatures.



## CHAPTER XVI.

[1800-1838.]

FOR nearly thirty years after the great measure whose enactment has been narrated in the last chapter the Irish Church appeared to enjoy the security expected to follow from its union with the Church of England. It continued to retain unimpaired the endowments and privileges which it previously possessed. Notwithstanding, however, these favourable appearances, events were preparing the way for a hostile movement, which subsequently developed itself extensively in Ireland.

These events had their origin in relations between the State and such of its subjects as professed the Roman Catholic religion, which had grown out of the Penal Code;\* for, although the greater part of that Code—all, in fact, which concerned rights of property or prevented voting at Parliamentary elections—had, before the union of Ireland with Great Britain, been repealed, there still remained in force provisions of grave importance depressing the political and social status of Roman Catholics. They could not sit in Parliament or the

---

\* See page 178, *supra*.

municipal councils; and they were excluded from offices of place and trust under the Crown, including in them the judicial Bench. For these grievances no relief was given by the Act of Union, their consideration being reserved for the Imperial Parliament, with an intention on the part of Mr. Pitt (the Minister in office at the time of the Union) and the members of his administration connected with Irish affairs that, whenever this assembly met, measures should be brought before it for the purpose of admitting to the constitutional rights enjoyed by Protestants all who were thus deprived of them.

Unfortunately the designs of these statesmen in favour of the Roman Catholics could not take effect, owing to the opposition of George III., in whose judgment to confer political power on members of the Church of Rome was a violation of the principles asserted by the settlement of the Crown upon his family in preference to the Stuarts, and who considered himself disabled from agreeing to any enactment having that operation, however expedient it might be, by the oath he had taken at his coronation.

The policy, which was defeated at this time, did not succeed until 1829. It failed when it would have been followed only by beneficial consequences; it succeeded when untoward circumstances impaired the good to result from its adoption. The relief granted to the Roman Catholics was preceded, and in fact was obtained, by an organized agitation of a magnitude and violence without parallel, the effects of which had been to reduce society in Ireland to a condition that bordered upon, and was attended by much of the evil

of, civil war.\* The Emancipation Act, as the statute to confer relief was called, assumed under these circumstances the appearance, not of an acknowledgment of claims founded in justice, but of a concession extorted by force.

So long as Roman Catholics in Ireland were engaged in a struggle for removal of the disabilities which deprived them of political power and official distinction, every other question which affected their interests remained, so far as they were concerned, in abeyance. They saw, that exclusion from Parliament stood between them and various objects which they desired; that until this outpost was won, it was useless to aim at more; and that, on the other hand, if it were captured, they would command the whole position occupied by the party against whom they contended.

In this condition of affairs what might be expected occurred. When emancipation was yielded, no gratitude ensued. It was due to agitation, not generosity or a sense of justice; and success, instead of satisfying, stimulated the public excitement. Political disabilities were not the only incidents of the social system in Ireland of which the Roman Catholics of that country complained: if agitation had been effectual to remove one of their grievances, why should it not also avail to remove others?

In no long time a new movement took the place of the former. At first engaged with demands for repeal of the Union and reform of the Parliamentary represen-

---

\* This was the description given by the Duke of Wellington when moving the second reading of the Catholic Emancipation Act in the House of Lords, 2nd April, 1829.



tation, it was subsequently directed against the Established Church. Unfortunately, when it turned in this direction, it found already existing among the Roman Catholic farmers and occupiers of the soil universal discontent occasioned by the abuses of the tithe system; while at the same time it was upon this system that the revenues of the parochial clergy almost altogether depended.

The value of the tithes levied at this time in Ireland may be reckoned at about six hundred and forty-three thousand pounds a year.\* Of this sum nearly five-sixths belonged to the Established Church, and the remainder to laymen, in whom monastic property had vested under grants from the Crown. In Ireland, lands in permanent pasture were exempt from this impost; as also were certain other privileged lands; but everywhere else the tenth of the produce of the soil had to be set apart by the farmers, and rendered by them in kind or value to the tithe-owners, lay and clerical, according to their respective rights. Extreme subdivision of the leaseholds threw the burden largely upon a poor and ignorant class, unable to protect themselves against the exactions of the agents employed to levy the tax, who, undertaking an unpopular office, endeavoured to obtain compensation through whatever arts were fitted to increase its profits. To uneducated tenants it was useless to point out that although paid by them tithe really fell upon the landlords, since the liability was necessarily taken into account when ascertaining their rents; or to suggest that the abolition of one

---

\* See p. 89, *supra*, note.

obligation was certain to lead to increase of the other. Such persons only considered the immediate claims upon them, and the vexations accompanying their enforcement.

To a demand, therefore, of this character nothing could be expected to reconcile the agricultural population, except an application of its proceeds for purposes either beneficial to their interests or acceptable to their sentiments and sympathies. But in Ireland in three provinces the vast majority of the farmers from whom the tithes were levied were Roman Catholics, while the revenue collected went in much the greater number of instances to maintain a Church whose ministrations these farmers rejected, and, where this was not the case, to lay proprietors. It increased the dissatisfaction thus caused that the persons subject to the liability were left to maintain their own clergy without the least assistance from the State.

The result was that associations to obtain the abolition of tithes were extensively formed. These continually increased in number and strength, until finally they expanded in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught into an almost universal combination of the Roman Catholic tenants to resist the collection of the tax. Resistance developed into systematized violence; the agents concerned in asserting the rights of the tithe-owners were obstructed and terrified; and in many places outrages of great enormity were perpetrated. Government tried, but failed, to enforce the law; and in the end, over the larger part of the island, the charge ceased to be levied.

Such a condition of society necessarily compelled on the part of the Imperial Parliament an examination of the position occupied by the Established Church in Ireland.

It began to be perceived that to meet the difficulties and dangers with which the Church was surrounded some assistance ought to be afforded by legislative measures calculated to remove the more obvious and pressing causes of complaint: and that in order to procure information requisite for such legislation it was proper, through means of duly authorized persons, to institute inquiries as to the revenues and state of the institution. Hence ensued the following proceedings in relation to ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland.

In 1832 an Act was passed, making composition for tithes permanent and compulsory. In the same year a Royal Commission issued for inquiry into the revenues and general condition of the Church of Ireland. Then in 1833 followed a statute, known as the Church Temporalities' Act, which was amended and supplemented by another of a similar nature in the next year. The object attained by these two Acts was a termination of assessments in vestries, which had been applied for repairs of the churches of the Establishment and for providing the requisites of divine service in the same churches, to which Roman Catholics were then liable equally with Protestants. In the place of such assessments a fund derived from the property of the Church was substituted. To supply this fund the number of the archbishoprics and bishoprics was reduced, the former to two, and the latter to ten; and the revenues of such bishoprics as were no longer to be filled (ten in number) were appropriated. The reduction of the number of bishoprics was accomplished by union and consolidation of Sees. It was to take effect as vacancies in the Bench of Bishops occurred. A Board of Commis-



sioners was appointed to administer the property of the suppressed Sees. If there should be an excess of income poor benefices might be augmented. The fund was to be also assisted by a percentage charged upon all benefices and dignities which were above £300 a-year in value, and by the emoluments of sinecures which, under a power given for the purpose, might be suspended by the Irish Privy Council upon the application of the Commissioners. Beside these provisions there was enacted an elaborate scheme for perpetuating the interests of persons holding under terminable leases from the bishops and dignitaries. These had been customarily renewable in consideration of fines for such limited periods as were permitted by previous statutes. The tenant was now enabled, by paying to the Commissioners a certain sum ascertained by them in such manner as was directed, to convert his tenure into a perpetuity, subject to a fee-farm rent, which represented the former rent and the average annual fine, and was liable to vary at intervals according as the prices of grain rose or fell. In 1834 a commission was issued to ascertain the number of persons in communion with the Church in each parish.

It was not, however, until 1838 that the most important of the remedies proposed to meet the complaints made by the Roman Catholics in Ireland in relation to the Establishment, was enacted. This was the Tithe Rentcharge Statute, which transferred the payment of tithe from the occupiers to the owners of land. In place of a proportion of production, or of the composition which had been substituted for, and represented it, was substituted a perpetual rentcharge, issuing out of the

land, and payable by the owners of the fee or of some long derivative tenure under the fee. The rentcharge was to be equivalent to three-fourths of the composition, and to be recoverable by proceedings similar to those for enforcing payment of other rentcharges, with some additional remedies.\*

There is no doubt that these measures, as they successively came into operation, tended to strengthen the Irish Established Church. They removed grievances and grounds of complaint productive of not unreasonable dissatisfaction. This was especially the case with the last Act of Parliament; for, after it was passed, the burden of maintaining the clergy of the Establishment was principally borne by Protestant Episcopalians, they being in the great majority of instances the paramount owners of land in Ireland.

But objections to the incidents attending the existence of an institution may be removed without affecting others made to the institution itself. No internal improvement, no amendment of the external relations of the Church, could be expected to appease the hostility of those who condemned a national religious Establishment as wrong in principle; or of those who held it, however advisable in other countries, to be unsuited to the actual condition of society in Ireland. The effect, therefore, of what had been done was merely to change the ground occupied in the controversy with the Church,

---

\* 1 & 2 Vict., ch. 109 (Ireland), A.D. 1838. To this measure was added, in 1854, the abolition of Ministers' Money, *i.e.* a tax payable for maintenance of the clergy in towns: the burden being thenceforward imposed upon property in the hands of the "Church Temporalities' Commissioners."

and to introduce for discussion a different range of topics and arguments. With their consideration the present chapter may fitly close.

Objections upon principle to a Church Establishment obviously extended beyond Ireland; they were equally applicable to the case of the Church of England. According to them, any connexion whatever between Church and State was to be condemned as originating in a misconception of their relations to the community. Two separate authorities, it was said, had each its own duties to discharge: those of the State being confined to secular affairs—the regulation and government of the people, the preservation of peace and order; while those of the Church related to spiritual affairs—the promotion of man's moral improvement and welfare. Their spheres of action were therefore distinct, and ought to be kept so. Otherwise, and if they became intermingled, the consequences to religion must, it was contended, be detrimental; for, in that case, the influence of the State, supported by immediate and visible advantages, would preponderate over higher and better impulses, and diffuse alike through the clergy and laity of the Church a spirit of secularity. With this spirit the whole ecclesiastical system as maintained in England and Ireland, from the royal supremacy at the summit to the territorial parochial arrangements at the base, its adversaries alleged, was pervaded.

In answer to these views the defenders of Establishments pointed out that, weak as the influence of the religious spirit in a community might be during the continuance of an Established Church, it must be weaker still if an institution of this nature, having existed, were



removed. Can (they asked) such an act be regarded as less than a declaration that the State, in its corporate capacity, disavowed all connexion with religion? By what means was it to maintain the connexion while isolating itself from every system in which religion was embodied? Then, would obligations renounced by the paramount authority survive in the mass it governed? Must not respect for them inevitably grow more feeble, and the practical sense of their importance decay? How was the State, more than its subjects, to escape from responsibility in relation to religion? Were not the reasons for the duties connected with it in the case of the latter applicable also in the case of the former? The State, like its subjects, is capable of resolving and acting; may receive benefits and injuries; can manifest approval or displeasure; has thus a personality. Equally with them it is indebted for preservation and well-being to a divine Providence; equally with them it is bound to acknowledge dependence and exhibit gratitude. By maintaining an Established Church a nation expresses its homage to the great Author and Founder of society.

Nor was the form which Establishment had, in Great Britain and Ireland, assumed open to the suggested criticism. No doubt, the supremacy of the Crown united and brought in contact civil and ecclesiastical authority: but that (replied its advocates) inflicted no injury on either; rather served both; for the former thereby gained a higher sanction than before, and the latter obtained for its divine mission encouragement and protection. To make the State religious did not necessarily render the Church secular.

In the discussions respecting these subjects, those who,

upon principle, opposed the establishment of Churches, very generally extended their objections to their endowment also. But by taking this course they much increased the resistance which they had to encounter. Impulses and convictions beyond the calculations of expediency originally caused the dedication of property to the maintenance of religious ministration and teaching; and the same forbade the diversion to secular uses of what had been in this manner dedicated. Was—it was asked—the sacred character thus impressed, deepened as it had been by the ratification of centuries, to be effaced, and all property without distinction to minister only to the ordinary and common ends or enjoyments of the community?\*

The alternative offered in lieu of Establishment and Endowment, by those who conscientiously opposed these means of making provision for the ministers of religion, was necessarily Voluntaryism. And, accordingly, they enlarged upon the contagious zeal, the superiority of motive which (it was alleged) accompanied its contributions; the blessings they would (it was said) impart alike to the giver and the receiver; while, in reply, the advocates of Establishment denied that the supply of instruction to be procured by such means could possess

---

\* These views were forcibly expressed by Sir James Graham in the House of Commons, 30th March, 1835: . . . "The property set apart by the piety of our ancestors to maintain and propagate the Protestant religion is sacred, and must be applied for these purposes. Those who minister at the altar should live by the altar. This decree is high as heaven, and you cannot reach to take it away; it is strong as the Almighty, and you cannot overthrow it; it is lasting as the Eternal, and you cannot unfix it. It now binds you as a legislature of Christian men, acting on Christian principles."

the requisite permanence, universality, or authority. Effective with congregations predisposed to welcome it, Voluntaryism languishes under the discouragement of apathy and neglect. It succeeds in periods of faith and piety (that is, when its assistance is least required), and fails in periods of scepticism and irreligion (that is, when help is most needed).

The more formidable adversaries, however, of the Irish Church were those whose objections were founded upon the peculiar circumstances by which that Church was surrounded. With them it was not establishment and endowment that were condemned, but an establishment and endowment employed to maintain a religious system not in harmony with the sentiments of a very large majority of the people among whom they were placed. The propriety of retaining any institution must, it was said, depend upon the practical results. Did it succeed or fail in the working? Tried by this test must not judgment go against the Irish Church? It had not gained over the mass of the people. It had always been and still continued to be the Church of the few, not of the many; of the rich not of the poor, for the few who adhered to it were the most wealthy members of the community.

Topics of this character were eminently adapted to win adherents, and were accordingly strenuously urged. They confined the field of contest to Ireland. By separating the case of the Irish Church from that of the English, they withdrew from the side of the former those who were only interested in the latter. Their force, however, was very largely abated by the consideration that the progress of the Irish Church had



been obstructed by hindrances over which it had no control. Its friends had been its worst enemies. They had associated it with civil war, with confiscation, with an offensive penal code. It was, too, involved in unpopularity excited by the mode in which its revenues had been raised. Now, owing to legislation enacted in and subsequently to 1829, these disadvantages were removed. The Church had entered upon a new career, relieved from the prejudices which a mistaken policy fostered, and might fairly claim that the effects of these altered circumstances should be allowed to develop themselves.\*

In aid of the plea thus presented, at least for delay, came also the reflection that the fall of the Church would endanger more than itself. In its present form as a Protestant Establishment it had subsisted for three hundred years; and if long enjoyment of privileges and territorial ownership were in one case of no account, were there not others in which they might also be disregarded? Would rights connected with secular property be respected when those connected with ecclesiastical were invaded? Besides, the Irish Church did not stand isolated and alone. It had by the Act of Union been united with the Church of England; and the continuance and preservation of the Church thus united was thereby declared to be a fundamental part of the union of the kingdoms. Could so important an article of a national treaty be violated without endangering the security of the whole compact?

---

\* Arguments of this character were powerfully used by Sir Robert Peel in a speech delivered in the House of Commons, April 2, 1835.

## CHAPTER XVII.

[1838-1869.]

**I**N the last chapter have been narrated the progress in Ireland of discontent in reference to the Church Establishment, the measures for its reform adopted with a view to appease this discontent, and the discussions which, notwithstanding, were raised upon the question of disestablishment. In the end the final decision of the controversy was postponed. Statesmen became desirous that the effect of the legislation, which had in Ireland removed the disabilities of Roman Catholics and transferred the burden of maintaining the Church Establishment from the occupiers to the owners of land, upon the position of the Church in that country should be left to the test of experience, and developed spontaneously without hindrance or interference.

This condition of affairs seems to me to have continued until about 1861, the adversaries of the Church in Ireland during the interval making little exertion to advance their cause. That it was then terminated, and that once more the demand for disestablishment was renewed was principally owing to the results of the census, which in that year was taken in Ireland, not merely of the numbers of the people, but also of their subdivisions arising from differences respecting religion.

This census first made the latter inquiry in a definite manner. Any previous attempt to ascertain the numbers belonging to each of the Churches or religious denominations in Ireland had been imperfect. The returns now made gave each person's own declaration of his religious profession. The figures, therefore, which their examination disclosed, could not err. They were as follows:—The whole population amounted to 5,798,967; of these, 4,505,265 had returned themselves as Roman Catholics; 693,357 as of the Established Church; 523,291 as Presbyterians; 393 as Jews; and 76,661 as of Methodist or other dissenting bodies.

The result of the census manifested clearly the great disproportion between the number of members of the Established Church and the number of the whole population. The advantage which this gave the advocates of the disestablishment of the Church was at once seen. It proved, it was said, the futility of projects for the conversion of Roman Catholics. If conversion had been expected to follow from the improved relations between them and the Church consequent upon the enactments designed to conciliate them, all such anticipations must be henceforward abandoned. There was no more conversion of Roman Catholics after than there was before these measures. Protestantism, whether Episcopalian or Presbyterian, had made no sensible impression upon the Roman Catholic portion of the people.

If this condition of affairs had arisen from neglect on the part of Protestants, want of success would have been of less consequence. But no such cause could be assigned. For more than fifty years before the census of 1861, energetic exertions to promote the conversion of Roman



Catholics had been made, under the conduct of associations formed with that design, which were supported alike by Church Protestants and dissenting Protestants, and supplied both from England and Ireland with ample contributions.\*

Notwithstanding, however, the encouragement which the results of the census of 1861 gave the adversaries of the Church in Ireland, six years elapsed before they made any move against it in Parliament. They were agreed in demanding its disestablishment, but not agreed as to the course to be pursued in reference to its endowments. Opinion was divided between their application for the needs of the State or other secular purposes and their distribution among the three religious denominations of greatest magnitude in Ireland, viz. the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Episcopalian, and the Presbyterian. It was obvious that until an united decision between these conflicting proposals was arrived at by the advocates of disestablishment, parliamentary action would be both useless and injudicious.

In 1867 delay ceased, and the question of the Irish Church was brought under discussion in the House of Lords by Earl Russell, then in that assembly leader of the Opposition, the Conservative party being at the time in office. He moved that a Royal Commission should be issued to inquire into the property of the Church of

---

\* An account of the proceedings adopted in the nineteenth century for the conversion to Protestantism of Roman Catholics in Ireland will be found in a Paper read at the Church Congress held in Dublin in 1868, by the Hon. and Rev. W. C. Plunket, now Lord Plunket, and Archbishop of Dublin in the disestablished Church of Ireland.—See *Report* of this Congress, p. 115; and see also (as to the failure of these efforts) Note II. of Appendix.

Ireland, "with a view," as it was expressed in the terms of the motion, "to make the property more productive, and in order to its more equitable application for the benefit of the Irish people." This resolution, with the omission of the reference to a more equitable application of the property, was acceded to by the Government of the day, and an undertaking was given that Commissioners should be appointed to make the inquiry which was sought.

Accordingly, later in the same year such Commissioners were nominated. They were directed to inquire and report upon the whole organization and property of the Church in Ireland: as to its archbishoprics, bishoprics, dignities, benefices, and corporations aggregate, and the revenues of the same respectively; as to its several united and separate parishes and parochial districts; as to its churches and chapels; and as to the number of members of the Established Church of England and Ireland inhabiting the parishes or districts attached to the churches: also as to the property and emoluments vested in, and administered by, the Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland which had been constituted by the Church Temporalities' Acts of 1833 and 1834, and their administration of the same; and lastly, to inquire and report whether any improvement ought to be made in the administration or distribution of the revenues, or in relation to the offices which were to be inquired into and reported upon.\*

---

\* The Commissioners were Earl Stanhope (the historian); Earl of Meath; Viscount De Vesci; Sir Joseph Napier (Ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland); Colonel Shafto Adair (afterwards Lord Waveney); E. P. Shirley; Edward Howes (one of the English Ecclesiastical Commissioners);

At the opening of the next Session of Parliament (1868), although the Commission thus appointed was engaged upon the inquiry committed to it, and had not then reported, the subject of the Irish Church occupied the attention of the House of Commons, and gave rise to considerable controversy. The Minister at this time in charge of Irish affairs in that House was the Earl of Mayo, remarkable then, as also afterwards in the more conspicuous office of Governor-General of India, for enlarged and generous views of policy. Objecting to the position of the Church of Ireland being made the subject of parliamentary controversy, before the Commission granted in consequence of Earl Russell's motion had reported, he, in the course of an elaborate speech dealing with the general condition of Ireland, expressed his unwavering hostility to any plan for total disendowment of the Church: "Of all the schemes that have been proposed," he said, "I object pre-eminently to that known as the process of levelling down." . . . "I believe that in these matters, as in everything else, confiscation is the worst proposal."

But the Government of which Lord Mayo was a member were in a minority in the House of Commons. Their support of these views lent no additional weight to them in the estimation of that assembly; and the leaders of the Opposition determined to make the question of the Church the occasion of immediate conflict between political parties. Resolutions, and then a Bill for the suspension of appointments in the Church of

---

George Clive, M.P.; and the author of the present treatise (then Vicar-General of the Province of Armagh). See as to the Acts of 1833 and 1834, p. 244, *supra*.



Ireland, were submitted to the House of Commons, with the avowal that they were preparatory to a complete measure of disestablishment being introduced when a new Parliament should meet, after the present had, in consequence of changes enacted in the representation of the country, been dissolved.

The justification offered for these proceedings was founded upon political reasons. Motives of expediency alone induced their adoption. No complaint whatever was made of the Church or of its Clergy; there was no allegation of any neglect or default on the part of either. "My belief," said Mr. Gladstone—who brought forward the proposition for suspension of appointments to offices—"is, that as far as abuses, in the common sense of the word, are concerned—that is, those which depend on the conduct of the bishops and clergy, and which are remediable by the wisdom and energy of the clerical body, or the purity of life of the lay members—the Irish Church is entirely free from such abuses. We must all accord to that Church this praise: that her clergy are a body of zealous and devoted ministers, who give themselves to their sacerdotal functions in a degree not inferior to any other Christian Church."

Both the Resolutions and the Bill for suspending Irish ecclesiastical appointments passed through the House of Commons by considerable majorities; but when the latter was transmitted to the House of Lords it was there rejected. Accordingly, further parliamentary action in reference to the Church of Ireland was deferred until it was seen what, in reference to the Church question, would be the opinions of the future members of the House of

Commons when returned at the general election, which was soon to take place.

Later in the same year (1868), the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the condition of the Irish Church made their Report. . . . They calculated the area of the entire island at 20,701,346 acres. The whole (they stated) was included in and subdivided into parochial divisions. The Church population scattered over this extent had been, as has been already mentioned, ascertained by the Census Commissioners to be 693,357. From them the Church Commissioners obtained an account of its distribution over the country, according to the parochial districts under separate incumbents. These they reckoned at 1478; and of them there were 181 which had a Church population above 1000; 1096 with numbers varying from that amount down to 40 persons; 110 with under 40 and not less than 20; and 91 with less than 20. There were 2 Archbishoprics, 10 Bishoprics, 30 corporations of Deans and Chapters, 32 Deaneries, 33 Archdeaconries, and 1518 benefices.

The property of the Church, according to the Report, consisted of tithe rentcharges, lands let to tenants, and lands and houses in the occupation of ecclesiastical persons. The value of the last description of property the commissioners had no means of estimating, except what were furnished by the valuations for local taxation; it was therefore returned according to these valuations; but such estimates were, in accordance with the principles on which an official valuation was made, below the letting value. The net income from tithe rentcharges and from lands let to tenants was calculated to exceed £580,000 a-year. Of this amount, more than

£113,000 a-year was administered by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Church purposes, such as the building and repairing of churches, and providing requisites for the celebration of worship; about £19,000 a-year belonged to the capitular bodies, and was by them applied towards maintaining the cathedrals and their services; and the residue supplied the incomes of the bishops, cathedral dignitaries, and beneficed clergy.\*

At the general election which followed the dissolution of Parliament upon the termination of the Session of 1868, a majority of the members returned to the House of Commons were favourable to the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Mr. Gladstone, who had moved the resolutions for suspension of ecclesiastical appointments in the previous year, was now Prime Minister; and he and his Government proceeded to prepare a measure which would carry the policy indicated by those resolutions into permanent effect. Ultimately, during the Session of 1869, the measure so prepared became law under the name of "The Irish Church Act."

The principle upon which the Act proceeded was

---

\* See further as to the Report, Note KK of Appendix. In a charge delivered in the autumn of 1868, subsequently to the publication of this Report, Archbishop Beresford observed:—"The proposition that the Church, after a severe scrutiny, has been shown to be not excessive in its general endowments, with no overgrown fortunes in its individual ministers, and free from the reproach of pluralities, has been established by the Report. What the clergy individually are (with rare exceptions), in character and conduct, and exemplary discharge of their duties, has been testified by their opponents; and by no one more freely and more fully than by Mr. Gladstone himself. If we are to fall, it is for no default of duty, no reasonable objection to our ecclesiastical system, nor to the constitution or condition of our Church: it is solely for external causes and reasons. Of this consolation we can never be deprived."



the total disendowment as well as disestablishment of the Irish Church, to be accompanied by the simultaneous withdrawal from other religious denominations of assistance, which for a considerable period had been afforded to them by the State. The instances in which this assistance had been given were—(1) to the Presbyterian Church by an annual contribution for the maintenance of its clergy; (2) to the Roman Catholic Church by an annual grant to the College of Maynooth, founded for the education of the Roman Catholic clergy. The former averaged from £45,000 to £50,000 yearly; the latter amounted to about £26,000 a-year. While, however, the three Churches were deprived of all endowment or pecuniary aid derived from the State, the interests of all incumbents of offices and benefices in the Established Church, and of all existing persons benefited by the grants to the other Churches, were respected, and either preserved or made a subject of compensation.

For the purpose of this treatise it is necessary to refer only to the following provisions of "The Irish Church Act":—On and after the first day of January, 1871, the union between the Churches of England and Ireland was declared to be dissolved, and the Church of Ireland was then to cease to be established by law. As of the same day, every Ecclesiastical Corporation in Ireland, whether sole or aggregate, and every Cathedral Corporation, was dissolved. Then also, subject only to such life estates and rights as were to be retained by ecclesiastical persons, and to such rights and compensation as were given to them in respect of any revenues taken from them, all the property of the Church, whether real or personal, was to vest in Commissioners, to be

called "The Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland," and by them to be converted and applied. Life estates in lands were preserved; but annuities were substituted for the incomes derived from tithe rentcharges, and were to be paid by the Commissioners. The Crown was empowered to create a corporation, to be termed "The Church Representative Body," which might hold and manage property for the disestablished Church. The churches in use at the passing of the Act were to be conveyed to this body, subject to the life interests of the incumbents; the same was to take place with such burying-grounds as adjoined these churches; and the Temporalities' Commissioners were to sell to this corporation for the benefit of the Church the houses of residence and a suitable proportion of the glebes connected with them. As an equivalent for private endowments, which it was felt that it would be unjust to confiscate without compensation, a sum of £500,000 was to be paid to the Representative Body.

By the general law Convocation could not be summoned, nor could it proceed to business, without the licence of the Crown. There was also in Ireland an Act known as the Convention Act, which forbade representative assemblies, composed of delegates returned by election, from meeting. If the disestablished Church were to govern itself, these difficulties must be removed. It was therefore enacted that any law or custom whereby the archbishops, bishops, clergy, or laity of the Church of Ireland were prohibited from holding assemblies, synods, or conventions, or electing representatives thereto, should be repealed, and that nothing in any

Act contained should prevent their meeting by representatives in general synod or convention, and therein framing constitutions and regulations for the general management and good government of the Church, and property and affairs thereof, and the future representation of the members thereof in diocesan synods, general convention, or otherwise.

It was also provided that, notwithstanding disestablishment, the existing ecclesiastical law, the existing articles, doctrines, rites, rules, discipline, and ordinances of the Church—but with and subject to such (if any) modification or alteration therein as might be made according to the future constitution of the Church—should be deemed to be binding on its members in the same manner as if such members had mutually contracted and agreed to abide by and observe the same, and should be capable of being enforced in relation to any property vested in the Church under the Act, as if it had been conveyed upon trust to be enjoyed by persons who should observe such ecclesiastical law, and the said articles, rules, and ordinances.

The mode in which in the case of the Presbyterian Church and the College of Maynooth compensation was made for loss by the cessation of the annual sums before paid to them, was by payment of capital sums of money which it was supposed would represent the value of the life interests of those who were then receiving and would have been benefited by the grants if they had been continued.

The surplus, after answering all the compensations provided by the Act for the disestablished Church, for the Presbyterian Church, and for the College of



Maynooth, was disposed of by a clause expressed in the following terms : . . . “Whereas it is expedient that the proceeds of the property (the subject of the Act) should be appropriated to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor; be it enacted that the said proceeds shall be applied accordingly in the manner Parliament shall hereafter direct.”\*

---

\* For the subsequent application of the surplus, see Note LL of Appendix.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

[1800-1869.]

THE two last chapters trace from the Union until Dis-establishment the external history of the Church of Ireland, the political controversies to which its position as an Establishment gave rise, and their final termination by the measure which accomplished both its disestablishment and disendowment. The internal condition of the Church during the same period is now to be examined, and the progress which, as an institution to teach and promote religion, it then made, ascertained.

For some time before the commencement of the nineteenth century there was (as has been already observed), both in England and Ireland, a marked improvement in the state of society regarded in its relations to religion. Initiated by local causes and impulses, this improvement derived strength and confirmation from the general tendency of the age. In the French Revolution the experiment had been tried of a nation without Christianity; of infidelity, under the sanction of authority, reduced to practice. Warned by the results, European opinion now everywhere cherished faith and morals as the only basis of social order.\*

---

\* See reflections to this effect in a Sermon preached in Dublin, in 1796, by Archbishop Magee, then a Fellow of Trinity College.—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 326.

In Ireland the influences of the period operated especially upon the Established Church. A new spirit pervaded both its clergy and laity. A sense of duty and responsibility in reference to conduct began more generally to prevail. There was now a frequent, where there had been a negligent, attendance on divine worship; and zeal to promote the well-being of the community, where there was previously only apathy. Literature and conversation, freed from former improprieties, became agents of good; the Scriptures and such religious writings as most effectually inculcated piety were disseminated; and, through the association of eminent persons for the purpose, irreligion was discouraged, and the formation of moral and virtuous habits promoted.\*

The same motives which urged to a religious course of life, impelled also to investigation of doctrine; for practice founds itself upon belief, and before action consideration of the principles proper to guide it is needed. An interest in theological inquiries, followed by examination of the questions to which they conduct, was gradually diffused among the members of the Irish Church. Much discussion ensued, and engaged extensively both the press and the pulpit.

Protestant Churches in general agree upon the points in reference to which they dissent from the Church of Rome; but with respect to matters beyond or outside

---

\* An Association formed "for discountenancing Vice and promoting the practice of Religion and Virtue" was, both before and after the Union, especially active in working for these objects. Even as early as 1796 its exertions were extensive. See a Sermon of Archbishop Magee, preached before this Association, 5th May, 1796.—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 313.



these they differ much among themselves. Thus—to take the instance of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—while all unite in rejecting the tenets connected with this rite upheld at Rome, they offer in lieu of them views varying between a close approximation to, and total divergence from, what these assert. To such diversities in the systems of Protestant Churches when compared with each other it is probably due that many of them, and among these the Reformed Churches of England and Ireland, have so framed their standards of faith as to allow to their own members (even the clerical) considerable latitude of opinion in respect of various questions.

Of such the most important were connected with the subjects either of free will and predestination, or of justification and the conditions under which pardon and acceptance are offered to fallen man. In the Church of Ireland, until 1634, when the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were adopted by Convocation, the views popular on these points were those which, derived from Luther and other Continental divines, were expressed in the Irish Articles of 1615.\* According to them, some are elected to eternal life not for their own merits, nor for any foreknowledge that they would have merits, but from “the good pleasure of God.” Only faith doth justify us; not “only the common belief in the Articles of Christian Religion and the persuasion of the truth of God's Word in general; but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospel, to the comfort of our own souls; whereby

---

\* See page 112, *supra*.

we lay hold on Christ with all His benefits, having an earnest trust and confidence in God that He will be merciful unto us for His only Son's sake."\*

After 1634, under the influence of Bramhall and the divines subsequently appointed to Irish bishoprics, the ideas of the school of theology termed, from the time of the Synod of Dort, Arminian,† began to find favour in the Irish Church, and from the Restoration they predominated. These held that the will is absolutely free, assisted but not controlled; that if there is election, it is election founded upon foreknowledge; that faith is only one of the conditions upon whose fulfilment salvation depends; and that good works is another equally indispensable.

This statement of differences of opinion in the Irish Church before and after 1634, it may, perhaps, in the case of the question of justification, be well to supplement by placing in juxtaposition the language of two bishops of the Church of Ireland, one writing before, and the other after, the Restoration. "Justification," says Downham, Bishop of Derry (1616-1634), "is a most gracious and righteous action of God, whereby He, imputing the righteousness of Christ to a believing sinner, absolveth him from his sins, and accepteth him as righteous in Christ, and as an heir of eternal life to the praise and glory of His own mercy and justice."‡ On the other hand, Jeremy Taylor lays down that justification is "by faith and good works

---

\* Articles of 1615, Nos. 36, 37.

† See page 118, *supra*.

‡ See Downham's *Treatise of Justification*, containing a very elaborate examination of the subject. As to himself, see page 119, *supra*.

together ; that is, by the obedience of faith, by the works of faith, by the law of faith, by righteousness evangelical, by the conditions of the Gospel, and the measures of Christ." . . . "Faith and good works (he adds) are no part of a distinction, but members of one entire body."\*

When, at the period with which we are now concerned, attention, moved by religious impulses, was directed to doctrinal questions, the consequent investigations naturally led to an examination of the earlier authorities respected in the Irish Reformed Church. Under every phase of opinion its members continued to hold in traditional veneration the great name of Ussher. That his views, as appearing in the Articles of 1615 (which were his composition) and in writings not differing from these Articles, now came into prominence and found approval with numbers can excite no surprise.

Of the tendencies thus created the Evangelical party, which—as there has been occasion to state†—had extended itself to Ireland about the close of the eighteenth century, took advantage. Some of its most eminent founders in England held Calvinistic tenets ; all placed in the foreground of their system the doctrine of justification by faith only ; they would themselves, therefore, have agreed with the ideas now revived within the Irish Church, and the effect of their teaching necessarily pre-

---

\* See Sermon preached by Taylor, when Bishop of Down, in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, entitled *Fides Formata ; or, Faith working by Love*. It was upon the text in St. James's Epistle—"by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

† See page 213, *supra*.



disposed their followers in Ireland to similar sentiments.\* Accordingly, placing themselves at the head of the advancing religious movement, the Evangelical clergy in Ireland turned their studies to the older divines, and derived from those studies the materials for their sermons. Thence they drew a complete theological system, confined, however, to a few prominent and important points. Zealous for its diffusion, generally speaking with fluency, and in many instances with unquestionable eloquence, they gradually impressed upon their congregations, and afterwards to a considerable extent upon public opinion also, their own tone of ideas and sentiments.†

Both Evangelicalism and Methodism were introduced into Ireland before the Union; but only the latter had up to the date of that event firmly established itself in the country. Thenceforward they continued to grow side by side; the former more among the members of the Church who were of the higher classes, and the latter more among those of the lower. The effects of their teaching were in some ways much the same. Thus the followers of each were in habits and demeanour strict;

---

\* I have already referred to Bishop Ryle's *Christian Leaders of the Last Century* for an account of the clerical founders of the Evangelical party.

† In the historical work of an eminent Presbyterian divine, which there has already been occasion to refer to, will be found an interesting notice of the Irish Evangelical clergy (*Killen's Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, vol. ii. pp. 383-389). The doctrine which assumed most prominence in their preaching was that of justification by faith only; and with some its inculcation was carried to an extreme, which led to neglect of the other Christian doctrines. See Professor Mahaffy's remarkable *Essay on the Decay of Modern Preaching*, and his observations, s. 41.

indisposed to take part in mere amusements, or in pursuits not of a grave character ; active in repressing vice and irreligion, and zealous to promote works of benevolence and charity.

It is to be kept in mind, when estimating the operation upon society of these religious systems, that their plans of association were distinct and unlike. Methodists had an elaborate organization, a peculiar discipline, a central authority : while Evangelicals were bound together simply by harmony of sentiments. And to this fact, probably, is to be attributed the tendency manifested in modern times by the former to dissent from the Church, while the latter have always adhered to it faithfully.

If division arises among the members of a Church, exhibited only in opinions and manners, without being embodied in some organization formed to uphold it, any estimate of the extent to which it reaches must be speculative. The Evangelical party was certainly numerous ; and probably at one time it was the more numerous portion of the persons in communion with the Church. Whatever, however, its number, its influence extended beyond what number could of itself produce. Those who would have refused to lend its views any open encouragement or approval whatever, were yet impressed by its precept and example.\*

But the differences respecting doctrinal opinions within the Church, which characterized the Evangelical party and their opponents, were not the only differences

---

\* "The Evangelicals," says Alexander Knox, who, as will be afterwards seen, opposed their ideas, "have been the chief instruments of maintaining experimental religion in the Reformed Churches."—*Remains*, vol. iv. p. 501.

which caused disunion between members of the Church of Ireland during the period we are now considering. After 1831 there were others also in relation to education. These had their origin in the following circumstances.

For some years before 1831 primary education in Ireland was conducted principally by a voluntary Association, which was aided with liberal grants from Parliament. This Association, from the place in Dublin where its offices were situate, was known as the Kildare-place Society. Its rules prohibited proselytism, and so far were calculated to recommend it to the various religious denominations in Ireland; but one of its regulations, requiring the Bible to be read in the schools without note or comment, was disapproved by the heads of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1831, a system of education, which it was hoped would be free from the objections made to that adopted by the Kildare-place Society, was established by the authority of Government, and was placed under the administration of a Board of Commissioners nominated by the Lord Lieutenant. The principle of the new system of National Education may be shortly stated as that of united secular, and separate religious, instruction.\* Selections from

---

\* Earl Russell, in his *Reflections and Suggestions* (1875), expresses the principle of the system administered by the National Board of Education in Ireland in words slightly different: . . . "The object of the system (he says) is to afford combined literary and moral, and separate religious, instruction to children of all persuasions, and as far as possible in the same school, upon the fundamental principle that no attempt shall be made to interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any description of Christian pupils."



the Scriptures were, however, prepared by, or under the sanction of, the Board, and used in the schools. The separation of religious from secular instruction, the consequent separation of the children from each other when religious instruction was given, and the substitution of selections from the Bible for the Bible in its completeness, were condemned by many of the Protestant clergy and laity.\*

That either upon theological or educational questions, or indeed upon any matters of opinion, there will not be, even in the same Church or association, disagreements, is a vain expectation: differences in character and intelligence, if there were no other cause, render them inevitable. Nor is it certain that if this were otherwise the interests of truth would be served; since where unanimity exists there is little research or inquiry. But if it be true that disagreements cannot be averted, it is also true that experience and reflection mitigate the asperities of discussion, and abate the sharpness of the distinctions between opposing systems and parties. For a considerable time before the disestablishment of the Irish Church there was a continually increasing tendency observable in its clergy and laity to moderation of opinion in reference to subjects of controversy; less importance was attached to the points which had given occasion for dispute, and party spirit was almost entirely inactive.

---

\* The growth of the system of the National Board of Education will be seen from the following figures:—

	Schools.	No. of Pupils.	Parliamentary Grant.
In 1834, . .	1106	145,521	£20,000
In 1887, . .	8112	1,071,768	£874,057

Such results were in a great degree due to the growth among the clergy of more enlarged and comprehensive ideas than previously existed. This had been going forward for a considerable time, following upon an improved course of education introduced in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin. The improvement began under Graves, Dean of Ardagh, who was Professor of Divinity from 1814 to 1829; and received much increased development from his successor, Charles Elrington, Regius Professor of Divinity from 1829 to 1850, and from O'Brien, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, appointed in 1833 to a Divinity Lectureship, originally founded by Archbishop King, but then for the first time adequately endowed.\*

The same causes which produced the decay of narrow views and party spirit in the clerical profession, operated to raise the standard of its members generally. During many years before disestablishment the Irish clergy were held in high estimation. They were for the most part well-educated, refined in manners, courteous and conciliatory in demeanour. For those who belonged to their own religious denomination they discharged with diligence the duties of their calling; for those who did not attend their ministry (the greater number being of the humbler classes), if not missionaries of religion, they were missionaries of civilization.†

---

\* Graves and O'Brien will be afterwards again referred to. Charles Richard Elrington, son of Thomas Elrington, D.D. (successively Provost of Trinity College, Bishop of Limerick, and Bishop of Ferns), obtained in 1810 a Fellowship; but soon turned from scientific and classical pursuits to theological studies, in which he attained the highest reputation.

† A testimony to the merits of the clergy of the Irish Established Church was, in 1867, given by Dr. Moriarty, the Roman Catholic Bishop

In narrating events before the Union there has been occasion more than once to comment upon the injurious effects of the mode in which the episcopal patronage of the Crown in Ireland was exercised. At that time the number of bishops in the House of Lords rendered their support of consequence, and hence reasons of a political character in most instances governed their selection. After the Union when the number sitting in each session in that House was less, political motives operated with much reduced force; and in selections from the clergy professional merit was in almost every case taken into account. A decided majority of the prelates, appointed between the Union and disestablishment, must be pronounced to have been in every way worthy of their position. Many added to their excellence, as theologians or clergymen, high attainments in other studies.\*

---

of Kerry, equally honourable to himself and them. In a letter to his clergy (Dublin, 1867), advocating disestablishment, he says: . . . "But it must be said, and we say it with pleasure, for we rejoice in all that is good, that in every relation of life the Protestant clergy who reside amongst us are not only blameless, but estimable and edifying. They are peaceful with all, and to their neighbours they are kind when they can; and we know that on many occasions they would be more active in beneficence, but that they do not wish to appear meddling, or incur the suspicion of tampering with poor Catholics. In bearing, in manners, and in dress, they become their state. If they are not learned theologians, they are accomplished scholars and polished gentlemen. There is little intercourse between them and us; but they cannot escape our observation; and sometimes when we noticed that quiet, and decorous, and moderate course of life, we feel ourselves giving expression to the wish: *talis cum sis utinam noster esses.*" See also Mr. Gladstone's testimony, p. 257, *supra*.

\* To mention only such of the bishops distinguished for literary or scientific pursuits as were connected with Trinity College, Dublin:—Kearney (Ossory, 1805), Hall (Dromore, 1811) had both been Fellows and then



Distinct notice of the persons eminent among the clergy in the period between the Union and disestablishment would, from their number, require far more space than in a historical summary like the present may properly be allotted for the purpose. Also, if undertaken, such a review could not be expected to prove satisfactory. We are as yet subject to the influences which affected those on whom we should have to pronounce judgment, and are imbued with like prepossessions and sympathies. A contemporary—at least a contemporary who has lived in intimacy with many whose acts must come under review—cannot hope to bring to the task the requisite impartiality. Some, however, of the persons and writings that in the first half of the nineteenth century influenced opinion in the Church of Ireland will be referred to.

Of these writings, as being the earliest in date, and also as being of remarkable excellence, the well-known work of Magee, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, upon *The Atonement*, may be first referred to. It presents one

---

Provosts; Magee (Raphoe, 1819; Dublin, 1822) had been a Fellow; Elrington (Ferns, 1822) had been a Fellow and then Provost; Brinkley (Cloyne, 1826) had been Professor of Astronomy; Kyle (Cork, 1835) had been a Fellow and then Provost; Sandes (Cashel, 1839) had been a Fellow; O'Brien (Ossory, 1842) had been a Fellow and a Professor of Divinity; Singer (Meath, 1852) had been a Fellow and Regius Professor of Divinity; Griffin (Limerick, 1854) had been a Fellow; Butcher (Meath, 1866) had been a Fellow and Regius Professor of Divinity; Graves (Limerick, 1866) had been a Fellow and Professor of Mathematics. (And here it may perhaps be well to observe that Fellowships in Trinity College are obtained by competitive examination and indicate high academic attainment.) Besides these, Dickinson (Meath, 1840), Wilson (Cork, 1848), Fitzgerald (Cork, 1857; Killaloe, 1862), although not Fellows, were highly distinguished in connexion with academic studies.

of the instances where an author seizes possession of a subject not yet occupied, and, by the skill and ability with which he treats it, appropriates it for ever. In the discourses and dissertations, of which the book consists, great learning is at the command of equally great intellectual power. The matters discussed are the general objections to a mediatorial scheme: there is no examination of the various theories which have been advocated by those who, concurring in admitting the doctrine of the atonement, disagree respecting questions necessarily growing out of or connected with it.\*

It was, however, these questions which, for the reasons already explained, especially occupied attention upon the revival of theological inquiry which we have been considering. Then the schools of thought that, as we have seen, had at different periods existed in the Irish Church in reference to the subject of Justification, came into direct collision, and found their respective advocates, among whom two deservedly claim pre-eminence by the intellectual power and theological learning displayed in writings discussing the matters in controversy. One of these was Dr. O'Brien, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, whose services in the Divinity School of Trinity College there has already been occasion to acknowledge, and the other was Alexander Knox, a layman of the Church of Ireland.

The work of the former, now referred to, consisted

---

\* A life of Archbishop Magee, evidently founded upon authoritative information, will be found in Wills' *Lives of Illustrious Irishmen*, vol. vi. p. 353. Magee's reputation for eloquence as a preacher rivalled Kirwan's; but, unlike Kirwan, he has left specimens which perfectly justify the reputation he attained with his contemporaries.

of a series of Sermons published in 1833. They were entitled *Ten Sermons upon the Nature and Effects of Faith*. These follow, and indeed profess, so far as doctrine, to follow, Luther and the German divines contemporary with Luther;\* but contain at the same time so much new argument and illustration, especially in connexion with an exposition of the moral effects of faith, that they may fairly receive the praise of originality. Faith is defined in these discourses to be not merely or properly a belief of the truth of the Scripture narrative concerning our Lord, or an assent of the understanding to certain propositions derived from that narrative; but to be trust in Christ or in God through Christ, founded upon such a belief or assent; an entire and unreserved confidence in the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us; a full reliance upon Him and upon His works. Justification is regarded as a judicial acquittal from the consequences of having violated the divine law, and acceptance as if it had been fulfilled. Righteousness of life is the consequence of faith, and receives from that principle the most effective motives and impulses.†

Alexander Knox, who now came forward as the opponent of the Lutheran School upon the question of justification, was one of the most remarkable men of his age. He had, before the Union, been Secretary to Lord Castlereagh, by whom that measure was carried through

---

\* In the preface to his Sermons, Bishop O'Brien says: . . . "If I have proved that the doctrine of justification which I have found in the Bible was found there by the Reformers of the Continent and of Britain, I have traced my views of the doctrine to the only human parentage which I feel very solicitous to establish for them."—2nd ed., p. xxii.

† See pp. 14, 68, 69, 255 of the *Sermons*, 2nd ed.



the Irish Parliament. Although subsequently offered a seat by this Minister in the House of Commons, he had abandoned a public career, and devoted himself to a life of study and religious contemplation. Possessing highly persuasive eloquence, he attracted within his influence some of the most gifted of his contemporaries.\* After his death in 1831, his essays, memoranda, and letters were published under the title of *Remains*: and from them more accurately than from reports of his conversations, we may collect his views in relation to the subject we are now engaged with. According to Knox, "justification" is rather internal than external; a provision not merely to effect acquittal from legal condemnation, but to deliver from the thralldom of sin and to purify from moral pollution. To forgive is, he admits, to remove the penalty; but then the worst penalty of sin is the reigning power of sin. Religion was with him a life; its end and object to exercise a transmutative influence over the heart; no doubt it presents a creed for acceptance, and appeals to the intelligence as well as the affections; but in his estimate the *amanda* ranked before the *credenda*.†

Reference to Knox naturally conducts to mention of

\* Bishop Jebb has left a striking testimony to Knox's affluence of ideas in conversation. "Scarce a day," he says, "passes in which some energetic truth, some pregnant principle, some happy illustration (and those illustrations powerful arguments), does not present itself, for which I was primarily indebted to the ever-salient mind of Alexander Knox." (Introduction to Jebb's edition of *Burnet's Lives*.) See also an article on Knox's *Remains* in the *Dublin University Magazine*, vol. iv. p. 242.

† In connexion with justification, see Knox's *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 281, 306, vol. ii. p. 13, iv. p. 375; and his essays *On the leading design of the Christian Dispensation*, and *On Redemption and Salvation by Christ*.

the most eminent of his disciples, Jebb, Bishop of Limerick (1823-1834). After their deaths a correspondence, which had been carried on between them for thirty years, was published—a work of great value, both as preserving admirable observations and reflections upon theological questions, and as casting much light upon the history of religion in Ireland during that period. Jebb's own works are also of high merit. To him is due the full development of the theory originated by Bishop Lowth, that parallelism, correspondence of thought, not of metre, is an essential element of Hebrew poetry.\*

About the time when Knox's *Remains* were published a movement originated with the High Church party at Oxford. Its leaders, in order to spread their ideas, issued a series of tracts, to which they gave the name of *Tracts for the Times*, whence their adherents were called "Tractarians." Knox, they alleged, both foresaw and contributed to the rise of this movement.† Its object was to revive higher views in reference to apostolical succession, the sacraments, and the authority of the Church both in itself and as guardian of traditions from the early ages of Christianity, than had for a considerable time prevailed; also to recommend reserve, when instructing the laity respecting some subjects, especially in connexion with the question of justification. These ideas found many supporters in England; and the Tractarian party there, not merely by their writings, but by

---

\* See Jebb's *Sacred Literature*, London, 1828, 2nd ed.

† This is asserted in an Article on Church Parties in the *British Critic* for April, 1839, which Newman, in his *Apologia*, says was written by himself.

numerous and conspicuous examples of zeal and piety, exercised much influence over the clergy. They found no followers in the Church of Ireland. Their system was by both the clergy and laity of that Church regarded as a mitigated form of all from which the Reformers dissented, and against which Protestantism was in Ireland contending. It was disapproved by the Irish Bishops; by some of them in charges to their clergy was decisively condemned; and it received from one of the Bench, Whately, then Archbishop of Dublin, assisted by other ecclesiastics of the Irish Church,\* in the *Cautions for the Times*, an answer that, probably, of all which the controversy called forth was the most effective.

In addition to his share in the *Cautions for the Times*, Archbishop Whately was the author of many treatises upon religious subjects, entitled to the highest place in theological literature. He was essentially a thinker, distinguished in his investigations, not more by the sagacity than the impartiality and judicial calmness with which they were conducted. He has been criticized as wanting in depth, and as being confined to a narrow round of topics. Neither observation is just. The notion that he wanted depth arises from his clear and lucid style, not surpassed even by Paley, against

---

\* Of this assistance the greatest and most valuable part came from Dr. Fitzgerald, then Whately's chaplain, and afterwards Bishop of Kilaloe, whose learning and sound judgment rendered him an invaluable ally in the controversy. A memoir of Bishop Fitzgerald has lately appeared, prefixed to an edition of *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, which he delivered in the University of Dublin. It is recorded of this eminent prelate that he was accustomed at times to write in his books the maxim, ἐν μέσῳ ἡ ἀρετή; and there is no doubt that his opinions were eminently characterized by its spirit.



whom a similar complaint was, for a like reason, urged : and the supposition that his range was limited is caused, not by the nature of the subjects which he discussed, but by a habit of repetition in the statement of his opinions, which he acquired at Oxford when as a tutor impressing instruction upon his pupils. It would be difficult to find essays more imbued with a philosophical spirit, or exhibiting more acuteness in the analysis of men's motives and conduct, than his Bampton Lectures *On the use and abuse of party feeling in matters of Religion*, or the work which was termed *On the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature*, but which, being of much wider scope than this title imports, might more appropriately have been called *Errors inherent in Human Nature in connexion with religion*.

The views of so eminent a person, in reference to some questions respecting which the opinions of other divines of the Irish Church have been stated, demand to be at least briefly noticed. In his *Essays on the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*, Archbishop Whately (as might from the subject he was engaged in considering be anticipated) discusses the predestinarian question. Referring to the opposite theories usually maintained in relation to election—one making it depend upon an immutable and unconditional decree arbitrarily determined upon, whereby a certain number are chosen, who, as a consequence, are influenced to a life of righteousness here and brought finally to eternal happiness hereafter ; and the other admitting a choice, but treating it as not arbitrary, as, on the contrary, being founded upon the foreseen faith and obedience of those who are its objects—he shows that these alternatives by no means exhaust the views in

reference to this subject which require to be examined. There may, he points out, be election without being election of the character suggested. The Jews were unquestionably as a nation elected, and elected arbitrarily: but it was an election not to blessings absolutely, but to a privilege, to the offer and opportunity of obtaining a peculiar blessing, such as was not placed within the reach of other nations. And so there is an election under the Christian dispensation, but of an analogous nature: an election not arbitrarily to salvation, but to privileges—the knowledge of the Gospel, the aids of the Holy Spirit, and the offer of eternal life. Of these all are exhorted, but none compelled, to make a right use: and according as this is or is not the case they will prove a blessing or a curse.\*

In the *Cautions for the Times* apostolical succession, and the ideas upon this subject suggested in the *Oxford Tracts for the Times*, are considered. While the authors of the *Cautions* affirm that the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons were instituted by the apostles in the original platform of the Church; they also assert that no unalterable model of government is drawn for the Christian Church in Scripture, as there was for the Jewish. There has been an apostolical succession in the sense that there has been such an order of men as Chris-

---

\* See the second series of these essays, 7th edition, pp. 68–93. Whately is sometimes supposed to have held predestination to be of nations; in one sense he did, for nations may enjoy peculiar privileges; but the doctrine of *National Election* (properly so called) is not his, but Archbishop Sumner's—following Locke—who considers rather who are called, whether nations or individuals, while Whately regards not so much who are called, as to what they are called, privileges or absolute blessings.

tian ministers from the time of the Apostles; but this is different from a succession in the individual minister, which these writers hold could never be established as a fact.\*

Whately is the fourth Irish prelate to whose opinions in relation to the episcopal and ministerial offices there has been occasion to refer;† the series of authorities may well be closed by referring to a sermon upon the same subject, delivered by Professor Archer Butler, of the University of Dublin, at a Visitation of the clergy of the diocese of Derry in 1842, which, like other writings from the same pen, exhibits a combination of profound thought with brilliant eloquence. The object of this discourse was to reconcile high views as to the episcopal office and the ministry episcopally ordained with universal Christian sympathy. The preacher assumes the sacred right of the episcopal office: that a divine commission was originally given: that it has been transmitted in direct and unbroken succession through and from the Apostles. He admits that, nevertheless, there are Churches, where this organization does not exist and whose ministry cannot claim this transmitted authority, which have manifested examples of religious influences, of practical righteousness, and of devotional zeal. Does the *fact* refute the *theory*? No, it is replied; for, while the union of a divinely-appointed polity with a pure

---

\* See *Cautions for the Times*, pp. 301, 302, 315, 316, with which Whately's *Kingdom of Christ* may be compared.

† See the opinions of Bishop Downham at p. 119, *supra*; of Archbishop Ussher at p. 142; of Bishop Jeremy Taylor at p. 158. With them compare Swift's views stated at p. 208; Paley's views stated at p. 222; and see also Appendix, Note MM.



system of religion was intended, it may be that the latter by itself can produce these results. Besides, relaxations of a prescribed scheme might be permitted, and thus, or from special interpositions, the success of exceptions from the original design may be explained.\*

Adhering to the limit already assigned for consideration of the theological writings of this period, it will be sufficient, in addition to those already noticed, to refer to the works of Graves, whose valuable services as Professor of Divinity have been already acknowledged, of Laurence, Archbishop of Cashel (1822–1838), and of Mant, Bishop of Down (1823–1848). The *Lectures on the Pentateuch* of the first, designed to apply to its record of events the tests of truth adopted by Paley in respect of the narratives in the New Testament, still maintains a high place in theological literature as a powerful argument for the veracity of the Mosaic history founded upon internal evidence. The *Bampton Lectures* of Laurence were designed to establish that the Articles of the Church of England were not framed to bear merely a Calvinistic sense; and with that object he enters into an investigation of contemporary ecclesiastical history, and of the opinions of the authors of the Articles upon the subject of predestination. The writings of Bishop Mant refer largely to questions which have been raised respecting the services, rules, and rubrics of the Church.† In the controversy respecting education he took part with those

---

\* See *Sermons* by Rev. William Archer Butler: Dublin, 1849, p. 458.

† A complete catalogue of the numerous writings of Bishop Mant, including his charges and sermons, will be found in Cotton's *Fasti*, vol. iii. pp. 213–218.

who contended that religion should be the basis of education. But the literary work with which the name of Bishop Mant is likely to be most permanently connected is the *History of the Church of Ireland*, from the Reformation to the date of the Union. To this there has been occasion in the present treatise very frequently to refer: and to it every student of Irish Ecclesiastical History must continue to refer, as the most complete and accurate collection of the facts occurring within the period of which it treats.\*

---

\* Another History of the Church of Ireland, also by one of its clerical members, the Rev. Robert King, ought to be studied in conjunction with Bishop Mant's. It commences from the introduction of Christianity into Ireland, and ends at 1622. Under the unassuming title of "A Primer," it contains the results of much research, especially as to the earlier periods. Since the first edition of the present work, these earlier periods have also been elaborately treated by Dr. Stokes, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, in two learned and interesting treatises *On the Celtic and Anglo-Norman Churches of Ireland*.

## CHAPTER XIX.

[1869-1871.]

THE Irish Church Act received the Royal Assent on the 26th of July, 1869. Under its provisions an interval of one year and five months was to elapse before the disestablishment and disendowment which it enacted would take effect. After the 1st of January, 1871, no valid appointment to any ecclesiastical office, benefice, or preferment, could be made in Ireland by the Crown, by any archbishop or bishop, or other ecclesiastical person, or by any lay patron. If the Church were to be continued, it was indispensable that in the meantime some Constitution should be framed which would provide for the discharge of spiritual duties by successors to the existing incumbents of offices and benefices.

It was the intention of the statute to confer upon the Church of Ireland complete freedom, and an unrestricted right to legislate in reference to its own internal arrangements. From the language of the provisions removing legal difficulties which prevented the meeting of a general Synod or Convention of bishops, clergy, and laity in Ireland, it was evident that those who framed them intended that measures



requisite to meet the exigencies of the period should be enacted by an assembly of this character. These provisions came into immediate operation. In the statute no notice was taken of Convocation; however, the language used in reference to the meeting of a general Synod or Convention included within it Convocation also.

Convocation in Ireland was, as there has been occasion already to mention, formed by the provincial Synods of the Archbishops meeting together.\* But without the permission of the Crown such a meeting was not lawful. From the reign of Queen Anne the Irish Convocation had never been either summoned or licensed to proceed to business by the Crown. Its sittings were therefore during the intervening period discontinued.† The Church Act dispensed with the necessity of summons or licence from the Crown, and the archbishops could thenceforward act without this previous authority being given to them. It lay with them at their own discretion to assemble Convocation by summoning each his own provincial Synod to a joint meeting.

It being, therefore, possible to assemble a legal meeting of Convocation, it was obvious that, although the Church Act seemed to contemplate in the assembly to legislate for the Church the presence of laymen, and Convocation was composed altogether of ecclesiastical

---

\* See page 108, *supra*.

† For some time before Disestablishment the bishops of the Irish Church had been desirous that Convocation should meet, but they could not obtain the requisite summons or licence from the Crown. See Note NN of Appendix.

persons, it yet was in the highest degree advisable to ask the assistance and obtain the concurrence of this body in whatever course was now to be pursued. If it were to recommend that its own meeting should be followed by the assembling of a Convention composed of laity as well as clergy, such a recommendation would lend additional sanction to a legislature of that nature, and probably remove objections which might otherwise be by some raised to laymen deciding upon several of the subjects which must come before it.

The number of archbishops presiding at this time over the Church in Ireland was two—being the number retained under the provisions of the Church Temporalities' Acts which had been passed in 1833 and 1834.\* These were the Archbishops of Armagh and of Dublin. Within the metropolitan jurisdiction of the former were included both the province of Armagh and the province of Tuam, as originally constituted in the system of the Church of Ireland; and within that of the latter the provinces of both Dublin and Cashel. The prelates who at this time filled these offices, after consultation with the other bishops, resolved, that in the circumstances in which the Church was placed, the first step that it was advisable to take was to summon their Synods with the object of forming them into a Convocation. They, accordingly, by mandates issued to their suffragan bishops, and by such other means as were in use upon the occasions when former Convocations were constituted, procured the attendance of their provincial Synods in the month of September, 1869, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin.

---

\* See page 244, *supra*.

The assembly composed of these Synods, when it met, formed itself into a Convocation. It consisted of the archbishops and bishops, of deans and archdeacons, and of clerical persons elected, some by cathedral chapters, and the rest by the clergy of the dioceses as their representatives.

The organization of the Episcopate at this time was as follows:—The number of episcopal persons to rule over the Sees of the Irish Church had, in consequence of the provisions of the Church 'Temporalities' Acts (1833 and 1834), been reduced to two archbishops and ten bishops.\* The Sees were incorporated, or united in the following manner:—Armagh with Clogher; Dublin and Glendalough with Kildare; Derry with Raphoe; Down and Connor with Dromore; Kilmore with Elphin and Ardagh; Tuam with Killala and Achonry; Ossory with Ferns and Leighlin; Cashel with Emly, Waterford, and Lismore; Cork with Cloyne and Ross; Killaloe with Kilfenora, Clonfert, and Kilmacduagh; Limerick with Ardfert and Aghadoe. Meath, in which Clonmacnois had from the reign of Queen Elizabeth been incorporated, was not united with any other See.†

The Convocation, according to precedent, was composed of two Houses. The two archbishops and the ten bishops formed the Upper House. As the Primacy of

---

\* For the Sees of the Church of Ireland, *vide* Note T of Appendix.

† The prelates who, at the time when this Convocation met, filled the two archbishoprics and the ten suffragan bishoprics were:—Beresford (Armagh); Trench (Dublin); Butcher (Meath); O'Brien (Ossory); Daly (Cashel); Knox (Down); Fitzgerald (Killaloe); Gregg (Cork); Graves (Limerick); Bernard (Tuam); Alexander (Derry); and Verschoyle (Kilmore).



Armagh had, from the time of a decision by Strafford\* in favour of this See, been always admitted, the Upper House was presided over by the Archbishop of Armagh. The Lower House, composed of the clergy, official and representative, elected as Prolocutor, Dr. West, Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin.† Convocation sat for some days debating the various questions which arose for determination, and passed resolutions designed to provide for the altered position of the Church. The first of these resolutions unanimously declared that the Church was now called upon, "not to originate a constitution for a new communion, but to repair a sudden breach in one of the most ancient churches in Christendom." This was followed by another resolution inviting the co-operation of the laity—"That, under the present circumstances of the Church of Ireland, the co-operation of the faithful laity had become more than ever desirable." The mode in which this was to be obtained, and in which the future Constitution of the Church might be most satisfactorily determined upon and framed, was held to be by the summoning of a general Convention, to consist, not merely as a Convocation or general Synod did, of bishops and clergy, but of bishops, clergy, and laity.‡ And ac-

---

\* See page 129, *supra*.

† The author of the present treatise acted as Assessor to Dean West.

‡ Questions were raised in the Convocation as to the propriety of imposing some restriction on the legislative jurisdiction proper to be conceded to the laity, so as to reserve for the clerical Order in the future Convention whatever might arise as to doctrine or worship, but those who raised these questions did not find support; and the resolutions adopted contained no suggestion that in the Convention there should be any distinction between laity and clergy as to vote or authority.

cordingly, in order to prepare the way for a Convention of this character being summoned, the Lower House of Convocation, with the concurrence of the Upper House, arranged what should be the number of the clergy and the nature of their representation in such an assembly. They resolved that the representatives returned to it from the clergy should be elected by them in Synods to be convened in the dioceses by their respective bishops; that the persons entitled to vote for such representatives in these diocesan Synods should be the beneficed clergymen, and also the licensed clergymen, provided they were of the order of priest, in each diocese, and in any exempt jurisdiction out of the diocese; and that the persons qualified to be elected should be Presbyters who had for five years been in Holy Orders. The number of representatives to this general Synod or Convention was to be in the proportion of one to every ten of the clergy entitled to vote in each diocese, together with an additional representative for any remaining number exceeding five. No dean or archdeacon was to have a seat *ex officio*; and no cathedral chapter was to return a representative.

So far, therefore, as the bishops and clergy assembled in Convocation were concerned, their decision was clearly announced to be, that a Convention or general Synod should be summoned, and that such Convention or general Synod should be composed, not only of bishops and clergy, but of laity also.

Similar views were in favour with the laity of the Church of Ireland: and previous to the resolutions of Convocation, a meeting had been held of eminent laymen, who addressed to the two archbishops a request

that they would convene a representative assembly under the name of a "Lay Conference," with a view to making arrangements for lay representation in a Convention or general Synod. The suggestion being approved by the Archbishops, they arranged that such "a conference" should take place in Dublin, and that representatives should be elected to attend it. For this purpose the following proceedings were then adopted:—In every parish a meeting of Church parishioners was held, at which parochial delegates were elected to a Synod convened by the bishop of the diocese. These lay parochial delegates having assembled in the Synods of their respective dioceses they elected representatives to a lay assembly, which was to be convened by the Archbishops. The number elected was one for every five of the parochial delegates. The total number was 417.

An assembly of laymen thus constituted, representing the laity of the Church in every diocese of the entire island, under the name of a Lay Conference, met in Dublin, in October, 1869. At the first meeting the Archbishop of Armagh presided. Subsequently the Duke of Abercorn acted as chairman. This body resolved that the lay representatives to a Convention or general Synod, composed of both clergy and laity, should be to the clerical in the ratio of two to one: that the proportion of lay representatives to be allotted to the respective dioceses should be partly based on population and partly on the parochial system; and they then fixed the number of laymen which, acting on that principle, should be allotted to each diocese. The entire number of laymen was to be 446. They also recommended that an organ-



izing committee should be appointed, consisting of not more than four delegates from each diocesan Synod—two lay and two clerical; and that such delegates, with their respective bishops, and such other learned persons as the bishops and delegates might think it expedient to call to their aid, should frame a draft Constitution to be submitted to, and voted upon by, the future Convention of bishops, clergy, and laity.

The resolutions of Convocation and of the "Lay Conference," which have been stated, were approved and adopted by the Episcopal Bench; and, in conformity with the recommendations contained in these resolutions a Convention or general Synod was summoned by the Archbishops. Representatives to attend it, both clerical and lay, to the number and in the manner suggested by Convocation and the Lay Conference, were elected by diocesan Synods.

The matters which called for the immediate decision of this assembly were—What was to be the future authority to legislate for the Church? Who were to have the right of appointing to its bishoprics and benefices? By what tribunals were questions, arising among its members in connexion with their rights or duties under its system or in relation to its discipline, to be decided? In what manner was the Corporation called the Representative Body, which the Church Act had provided for the management of Church property, to be constituted? Neither doctrine, nor the former standards of faith, nor the services for divine worship, nor the polity and discipline of the Church of Ireland, had been in any way interfered with by the disestablishment of

the Church.\* There was no need, therefore, for the Convention to consider these subjects.

On the 15th of February, 1870, the Convention of the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church of Ireland met in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and subsequently, by adjournments, at other places in Dublin, until the 2nd of April, when it was prorogued. In the autumn of the same year it again sat in Dublin, and then completed the enactment of a Constitution for the Church, and of a code of laws which defined the authority of the persons and bodies empowered to act in relation to ecclesiastical affairs, and which also contained clauses designed to regulate the proceedings of these bodies. "The Constitution" having been subsequently amended, its provisions will be stated, not exactly as they were then expressed, but as they now (1890) stand.†

---

\* This was very clearly and forcibly pointed out, soon after the Irish Church Act was passed, in a Charge delivered to his clergy by the then Primate, Archbishop Beresford—a prelate whose statesmanlike qualities eminently fitted him to preside during a period of transition. In the same Charge he adverted to the temptations which beset the sudden acquisition of absolute powers of government, and of legislation, by bodies unaccustomed to such responsibilities; and cited, and impressed on his hearers the profound wisdom of, the well-known words of Lord Bacon—"It is good that men in their innovations should follow the example of time itself, which, indeed, innovateth greatly but quietly, and by degrees scarce to be perceived; it is good also not to try experiments unless the necessity be urgent, or the utility evident; and well to beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change, and not the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation."—See *Charge*, published in Dublin, 1869.

† The Journal of the Convention was published after it was dissolved. A preface to it states the events (*i.e.* the meeting of Convocation, and of the Lay Conference, and the preliminary proceedings that have been referred to) which preceded the Convention.

“The Constitution” deals with the Synods which were to represent the Church, the persons entitled to elect members to sit in them, and the qualifications of the persons who might be elected; also with the powers and duties of these assemblies. It provides for the episcopal, parochial, and cathedral organization; for the construction of tribunals; and for the frame of the Representative Body. But before referring to its provisions in reference to these subjects it is proper to notice a Preface (prefixed to the legislation concerning them), which records the adherence of the Church to its former doctrines and principles.

This Preface consists of “a preamble and declaration.” “The preamble” recites that—the Legislature having enacted that on and after the first day of January, 1871, the Church of Ireland should cease to be established by law, and that the Ecclesiastical law of Ireland should cease to exist as law, save as provided by “the Irish Church Act”—it had become necessary that the Church of Ireland should provide for its own regulation. “The declaration,” after expressing belief in the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as given by inspiration of God, and containing all things necessary for salvation, proceeds to state that the Church will continue to profess the faith of Christ as professed by the primitive Church; that it will minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, and maintain inviolate the three Orders of Bishops, Priests or Presbyters, and Deacons in the sacred Ministry; and that being Reformed and Protestant it reaffirms its constant witness against those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the primitive faith had been from



time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation were disowned and rejected. The Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, with the forms for consecration of Bishops and ordination of Priests before in use, are then approved and accepted, but subject to such alterations as might be made therein by the lawful authority of the Church. The chief legislative power in the Church, and also "such administrative power as is consistent with its episcopal constitution," are defined to be in a Synod composed of Archbishops, Bishops, and Representatives of clergy and laity.

"The Constitution" provides for a General Synod supreme over the whole Church, and for Diocesan Synods to deal with local affairs; for parochial organization; for the appointments to bishoprics and benefices; for ecclesiastical tribunals and for the mode in which the corporation of the Representative Body of the Church was to be constituted.

The General Synod is to consist of three distinct Orders, viz. the bishops, the clergy, and the laity; and of two Houses, the House of Bishops and the House of Representatives. Both Houses are to sit together in full Synod for deliberation and transaction of business, except in cases provided for by the statutes. The House of Bishops is formed of all archbishops and bishops for the time being; and the House of Representatives of 208 representatives of the clergy, and 416 representatives of the laity. The representatives are to be returned from the dioceses in certain proportions specified in the statute, and to be elected triennially by Diocesan Synods, whose constitution is afterwards prescribed. The members of the House of Representatives are to vote together, unless,

upon a division being called, ten members shall by a requisition in writing require the votes to be taken by Orders, when they shall be so taken; the Orders then voting separately. Every proposed statute or canon is to be introduced as a Bill; the procedure in connexion with its introduction, and subsequently in order to its becoming law, is to be in accordance with regulations expressly specified. The bishops are to vote separately; and no question shall be deemed to be carried unless there be in its favour a majority of the bishops present, if they desire to vote, and a majority of the clerical and lay representatives present voting conjointly or by Orders; but if a question affirmed by a majority of the clerical and lay representatives, voting conjointly or by Orders, but rejected by the bishops, shall be re-affirmed at the next ordinary Session of the General Synod, by not less than two-thirds of the clerical and lay representatives, voting conjointly or by Orders, it shall be deemed carried, unless it be negatived by not less than two-thirds of the then entire existing Order of Bishops, the said two-thirds being then present and voting, and giving their reasons in writing. A Bill has to be read twice before going into Committee; then, when it has passed through Committee, in order to become law it must be read a third time. No modification or alteration can be made in the articles, doctrines, rites, rubrics, or (save so far as was rendered necessary by the Church Act) in the formularies of the Church, unless by a Bill. A Bill for any such purpose must be founded upon a resolution passed by the Synod, and no such Bill or resolution shall be deemed to be passed except by majorities of not less than two-thirds of each Order of

the House of Representatives present and voting. The General Synod is to meet every year; but provision is also made to enable special meetings to be convened.

Without entering more minutely into the laws relating to the General Synod, enough of them has been stated to show that they combine in a remarkable manner elements which conduce both to progress and permanence; the former results being ensured by the representative character of the Synod; and the latter by the vote by Orders, by the proportion of each Order which, when the vote is taken by Orders, is required in order to enable any alteration to be made in the articles, doctrines, and formularies of the Church, and by the ultimate veto given under certain conditions to the House of Bishops.

The diocesan Synods consist of the bishop, the beneficed and licensed clergymen of the diocese, and of laymen; every parish is entitled to return two laymen along with each of its officiating clergymen; and the lay representatives are to be elected by vestrymen registered as directed. The cathedrals are also represented; and, in the diocese of Dublin, Trinity College returns members to the Diocesan Synod.

The regulations of "the Constitution" in reference to the appointments to archbishoprics, bishoprics, and benefices upon vacancies, are as follows:—The archbishops and bishops (except in the instance of the archbishopric of Armagh) are elected by the diocese or united dioceses (as the case may be) then to be filled, the manner in which the voting is to be conducted being defined by express rules. In the case of Armagh, upon vacancy the Synod of Armagh elects an *ad interim*



bishop. The bishops and the person chosen for this office then elect one of themselves to be Archbishop of Armagh. If the *ad interim* bishop is not selected, he takes the place of the bishop who is preferred. The incumbents of benefices are elected by Boards, each composed of the following persons, viz. :—Three laymen, elected by the vestry of the vacant parish, termed parochial nominators; two clergymen and one layman, elected by the Diocesan Synod, termed the diocesan nominators; and the bishop of the diocese, who is to preside at the election.

The tribunals appointed to decide upon questions or complaints connected with the laws of the Church, or with elections to offices, are a Diocesan Court and an Appellate Court; the latter being called the Court of the General Synod. The former Court is composed of the bishop of the diocese, with his chancellor (who must be a barrister of ten years' standing) as assessor, of a clergyman, and of a layman, the two latter selected by rotation from a list of three clergymen and three laymen chosen by the Diocesan Synod. The Court of the General Synod is composed of the three members of the House of Bishops first in order of precedence who may be able to attend, and of four lay Judges taken from a list of laymen, who hold, or have held, in the civil courts certain judicial offices, and who are elected by the General Synod to be members of the Court.

Before the Convention had finally concluded its sittings, a Charter, dated 19th October, 1870, incorporating "the Representative Body of the Church of Ireland" in accordance with provisions relating to that

body which were voted as part of the Constitution, was granted by the Queen.

By the enactment of a Constitution, the continuance of the Church as an ecclesiastical organization was ensured; and by the incorporation of the Representative Church Body all difficulties in the way of the preservation and management of the property which, either under the Church Act it upon disestablishment received, or from donations and contributions it might afterwards receive, were removed.

## CHAPTER XX.

[1871-1889.]

WHEN an ecclesiastical Parliament to make laws for the Church and a Corporation to hold and manage its property had been constituted, the matters which first engaged the attention of these bodies were connected with the interests of the clergy in the emoluments of their benefices, and with some provisions of a peculiar character in reference to these interests which were contained in the Act of 1869.

As has been already stated, the legislation in reference to the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church either preserved or gave compensation for the life estates of ecclesiastical persons. In the case of the lands, which by virtue of their offices they enjoyed either in possession or as landlords, it preserved their rights; in the case of the tithe rentcharges which they received, it substituted annuities of equivalent amount. The clergy might voluntarily accept annuities also in place of their estates in lands. Whatever annuities they in either way became entitled to, were to be paid out of the property which was transferred from the Church to the Commissioners of Church Temporalities appointed by the Act.



These arrangements, it will be observed, if they stood by themselves necessarily kept up a certain degree of relation between, if not the State, yet an organ of or department under the State, and the individual clergy of the disestablished Church, and postponed the period of converting and making use for other purposes of the property which was taken from that institution. Such a relation of the clergy with the State it was not desirable to maintain longer than was absolutely necessary; and accordingly with a view to effect its speedy termination a process was devised, and by special powers in the Act enabled, whereby, without any infringement of individual rights, this object might be effected.

The statutable provisions in relation to this process (which has received the name of Commutation) were as follows:—Instead of the Temporalities' Commissioners continuing to be the paymasters of the ecclesiastical persons entitled to annuities for their lives under the Church Act, the Representative Body might with the consent of these persons be substituted in that capacity. If the clergy and this Corporation consented, the capitalized value of the annuities was to be paid over to the latter, subject to and charged with equivalent annual payments. And as this proceeding would only have vested in the Representative Body the exact value of the annuities which it was in return to pay, it was further provided, with a view to its security in undertaking such an arrangement, and to meet also the expenses of management, that in all dioceses where three-fourths of the ecclesiastical persons should agree to commute, an addition of twelve pounds in the hundred was to be made to the commutation money.

Commutation being considered likely to serve the interests of the Church, because tending to promote the union and mutual co-operation of its members, the Representative Body not merely gave consent to its being carried out, but with the approval of the general Synod framed rules in connexion with it calculated to induce the bishops and clergy to give their consent and assistance for the same purpose. This it was enabled to do in consequence of another power contained in the Church Act, whereby the Representative Body was authorized to make terms with the commuting clergy in respect of their annuities.

The result was that Commutation was brought into operation in all the dioceses, and was accepted by the bishops and (with a few exceptions) by the clergy. Accordingly, the capitalized value of the annuities of commuting ecclesiastical persons has been paid over to the Representative Body charged with the annuities. The amount paid over was £7,581,075, and the annuities came to £596,843 yearly.

The owners of the annuities were by the Church Act bound to discharge their former duties, unless released from them by the Representative Body. In this way during their lives provision for the spiritual care of the members of the disestablished Church was secured; after their deaths this would no longer be the case. At that time payment of the annuities would have exhausted, or at least so diminished as for practical purposes to exhaust, the capital sum received as representative of their value. The resource of the future must then be voluntary contributions.

Under such circumstances it seemed fair that the

existing generation, whose own needs were provided for, should contribute towards some endowment in aid of those who were to succeed them. If the parishes at once assessed themselves for the payment of annual sums to the Representative Body, the latter might in an equivalent degree abstain from drawing upon the capital sum for payment to the commuting clergy of their annuities, and thus preserve a proportionate amount of the fund for a permanent endowment.

Accordingly, arrangements were made between the Representative Body and the Diocesan Synods, under which annual sums are paid by the parishes to the former; and in return this corporation has engaged, according as vacancies occur among the existing incumbents, to pay to their successors a portion of the incomes assigned for them.

Rules were made in connexion with and to induce Commutation, which further aided the same object of endowment for the future. The commuting clergy were enabled, if they should at any time afterwards wish to retire from the discharge of duty, to do so, upon the condition that the capitalized value of their annuities should be divided between them and the Representative Body in proportions regulated by a fixed scale, according to their ages.

The result of these measures has been to accumulate in the hands of the Representative Body a surplus above what will be required to meet its liabilities to the surviving ecclesiastical persons, of whose annuities they received the capitalized value. What the amount of this surplus will ultimately be necessarily must depend upon the duration of the lives of the annuitants. To this



surplus, as an endowment for the future, are to be added the sum of £500,000, granted by the Church Act to compensate for the loss of private endowments, and a large amount of legacies and donations given since disestablishment.\*

Beside the duties devolving upon the Representative Body, which have been already adverted to, it was empowered to purchase the houses of residence of the bishops and clergy and portions of the demesne and glebe lands attached to them. The Act fixed the price to be paid for the houses, gardens, and curtilages, but left that which was to be paid for the lands to be settled by agreement. The Representative Body acted upon this power, and invested part of the funds in its hands in purchasing the houses and such portions of the adjoining lands as were allocated by the Temporalities' Commissioners to accompany the houses.

Unless when bound by special trusts or when required to meet obligations otherwise affecting it, property in the hands of the Representative Body is under the control and subject to the disposal of the General Synod. The Representative Body therefore presents to each yearly meeting of the General Synod a report containing full particulars of the property and financial affairs of the Church, and in general submits along with the amount recommendations relating to the management and application of any property then available for immediate use, whose application had not previously been directed.

In the organization of the Church there have been changes. Some parishes have been united, and the

---

\* See as to the financial condition of the Church Note OO of Appendix.

boundaries of others have been altered. The number of benefices has been diminished. In the case of the Episcopate there has been an addition of one bishop. The diocese of Clogher, which at the period of disestablishment was united to Armagh, having a large number of members of the Church, has been again constituted a separate bishopric with an endowment principally derived from subscriptions for the purpose. There have been twelve elections by Diocesan Synods to bishoprics since disestablishment, and one to the Primacy by the Bench of Bishops.\* The number of clergy at present (1890) serving in the Church of Ireland is upwards of 1500.

Of the legislation passed by the General Synod since disestablishment some enactments in relation to the Prayer Book, services for public worship, and formularies of the Church, are of importance. The Church Act while leaving in force the then existing Articles of Faith, the discipline, rules, rites, and doctrines of the Church, gave the Church assembled in Synod power to modify and alter them. Propositions were therefore brought forward on several occasions in the General Synod in reference to these subjects, which led to a revision of the Prayer Book and of the services. Canons, in many respects substantially new, were also enacted.

When the revision of the Prayer Book had been completed by the General Synod, an edition of it as

---

\* Mant in his *History*, and Cotton in his *Fasts*, give the names of Bishops, according to their succession, the former from 1535 to 1840, and the latter from 1551 to 1850. It seems enough, therefore, to state the names of the bishops in 1850, and the subsequent appointments. See Note PP of Appendix.

revised was published under its authority. Since that time the use of the Services contained in this edition, and conformity to the directions of its Rubrics, have been enforced in the case of clergymen who, subsequently to the disestablishment of the Church, have been ordained, or have accepted a new appointment, or have by any other act become legally bound to obey the laws and canons of the Church.

In a Preface prefixed to the Prayer Book the circumstances which led to its revision are explained. Some changes in rubrics and services were indispensable by reason of the altered position of the Church consequent upon its disestablishment. This being so, many desired that occasion should be taken also to make a full review of the forms then in use. Such an attempt the Synod was the more willing to make, because it “perceived to its comfort that all men on all sides professed their love and reverence for the Book of Common Prayer in its main substance and chief parts, and confessed that it contained the true doctrine of Christ, and a pure manner and order of divine service, according to the Holy Scriptures and the practice of the Primitive Church.”

The changes contained in the revised Prayer Book, the Preface states, imply no censure on the former book: the reasons for them will for the most part appear upon a comparison of the book as revised with what it had been before revision. In some instances, however, further explanations “why certain things have been altered and others retained” were deemed advisable, and have been given. The instances are the services for the Holy Communion and for Baptism, the office for



the Visitation of the Sick, the form of Ordination for Priests, the Athanasian Creed, and the Lectionary.

After these explanations—which will be afterwards stated—the Preface ends with an admonition addressed to all who, for different and, it might be, opposite reasons, might object to the revision as it had been accomplished : . . . “If (it proceeds) some shall complain that these changes are not enough, and that we should have taken this opportunity of making the Prayer Book as perfect in all respects as they think it should be made, or if others shall say that these changes have been unnecessary or excessive, and that what was already excellent has been impaired by doing that which, in their opinion, might well have been left undone, let them, on the one side and the other, consider that men’s judgments of perfection are very various, and that what is imperfect, with peace, is often better than what is otherwise more excellent, without it.”

With respect to the Service for the Holy Communion the Preface—after referring to complaints made of it as if lending a pretext for the teaching of doctrine concerning the presence of Christ in that Sacrament repugnant to what is set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles—declares that there was not found in the formularies any just warrant for such teaching, and that therefore no other change was made than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the Twenty-eighth of the said Articles.\*

---

\* The question and answer introduced in the Catechism are :—

*Question.*—After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord’s Supper?

*Answer.*—Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner ; and the mean whereby they are taken and received is Faith.

With respect to the "formularies relating to baptism" the Preface states that no substantial change had been made, though (it adds) some had desired to alter or omit certain expressions touching which diversities of opinion had prevailed among faithful members of the Church. At the same time it is declared that the liberty of expounding these formularies, hitherto allowed by the general practice of the Church, is recognized; and that, as concerning those points whereupon such liberty has been allowed, no minister of the Church is required to hold or teach any doctrine which has not been clearly determined by the Articles of religion.

With respect to the Office for Visitation of the Sick the Preface observes that the special absolution in this office has been the cause of offence to many; and that, as it was a form unknown to the Church in ancient times, and as no adequate ground for its retention was seen, and there was no ground for asserting that its removal would make any change in the doctrine of the Church, it was deemed fitting that in the special cases contemplated in this office, and in that for the Visitation of Prisoners (an office peculiar to the Irish Prayer Book), absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the office for the Holy Communion.

With respect to "the formula of Ordination of Priests," the Preface states that no change was made: for that, upon a full review of the formularies, it is deemed plain that, save in the matter of ecclesiastical censures, no power or authority is by them ascribed to the Church or any of its ministers in respect of forgiveness of sins after baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing on God's part remission of sins to

all that are truly penitent, to the quieting of their conscience, and the removal of all doubt and scruple.\*

With reference to the Athanasian Creed, the Preface points out that the rubric directing its use on certain days has been removed; but that, in so doing, the Church has not withdrawn its witness, as expressed in the Articles of religion, to the truth of the articles of the Christian Faith therein contained. And as to the Lectionary, it observes that the table of lessons, which had been then lately adopted by the Church of England was generally followed, with "these principal exceptions" that lessons from the Apocryphal Scriptures were omitted, and that the whole, instead of a part, of the Revelation of St. John was included.†

The canons are fifty-four in number. Among them are regulations as to the dress of the clergy, the conduct of the services, the ornaments and structures of the Church buildings, the right to pews or seats, and other matters connected with divine worship. They also contain provisions conducive to the enforcement of discipline among ecclesiastical persons.

With the account of the proceedings of the Irish Church subsequent to the Act of 1869, which has been given in this chapter and in the chapter immediately preceding it, I close the sketch of its history intended to be the subject of the present treatise.

---

\* As to the objections made in the General Synod connected with the Communion and Baptismal Services, and the form of Ordaining Priests, see Note QQ of Appendix.

† The entire of the alterations made in the Prayer Book will be found in Note RR of Appendix.



There is no doubt that by disestablishment the Church was placed in circumstances of extreme difficulty. Accustomed, from the date of the statute which declared the supremacy of the Crown in Ireland, to act in union with the State, it was abruptly left to its own uncontrolled guidance. The right to legislate for its needs, and the authority to regulate its proceedings, became vested in a numerous body returned by a still more numerous constituency. The danger incident to the exercise of power by popular assemblies was at once imminent. There was reason to fear that change for the sake of change might be desired ; that when change was effected it would reflect only the theological views with which the majority might happen to sympathize ; and that thus the range of free thought would be narrowed. Both these evils have been avoided. The Church has, so far, come forth in honour and safety ; it has retained unity within itself and continuity with the past ; it is still substantially the same in polity, in doctrine, in ritual, as it heretofore was. It has not parted with its comprehensiveness ; it permits every difference of opinion that was formerly allowed.

For a complete estimate of the effects of disestablishment upon the welfare of the institution the time has not arrived. The Church is not as yet cast solely upon its own resources. When separated from the State it still retained in its service a clergy of high excellence, educated and pious, bound, unless released by the Church itself, to discharge for their lives their former duties. With their assistance its organization still continues to be maintained ; according to their example the standard of its theological teaching is still regulated.

If it is too soon to forecast the effect of disestablishment upon the internal prosperity of the Church, it is certainly also too soon to judge of its effect upon other religious denominations. No substantial alteration has taken place in the relative numerical proportions of Roman Catholics, Protestant Episcopalians, and Presbyterians. Some provisions in the constitution of the Church as it existed before disestablishment, which were objected to by Protestant Nonconformists, and which therefore furnished reasons for their separation from it, have been removed. Thus the charges formerly urged against the Church of being controlled and secularized by the State, and bound to accept the nomination of the Crown to its chief offices, are no longer applicable. It is free and self-governed; while all right of patronage within it is vested in authorities constituted by its own legislation. In place of the coercive jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts, formerly complained of, tribunals have been substituted which rest upon consent and voluntary submission. Yet it cannot be said that there is as yet apparent any nearer approach to union among Protestant ecclesiastical systems in Ireland; nor can such a result be predicted as likely to occur. Religious divisions survive their causes, and continue to exist long after the original grounds of difference disappear.

## APPENDIX.

---

### NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

I HAVE thought it better to defer to an Appendix the consideration of some subjects which, if introduced in the narrative, would have unduly interrupted its course. To the notes requisite for this purpose I have added others containing citations from original authorities which have ceased to be reprinted. For a correct estimate of transactions of remote date, we must note not only the fact, but the description of it, by those who record it—not only what is narrated, but how it is narrated.

---

#### NOTE A. PAGE 6.

The necessity of reform in the condition of the Churches of the Continent, which at the commencement of the sixteenth century acknowledged the Papal Supremacy, is admitted by the most distinguished writers who have taken the Roman Catholic side in the controversies to which the Reformation subsequently gave rise. It is enough to refer to Bellarmine and Bossuet. (See in the works of the former, *Concio* xxviii., ed. Colon. Agr. A.D. 1617, vol. vi. p. 296, and of the latter, *Histoire des variations des Eglises Protestantes*, liv. i. s. 1). Bellarmine's words are extremely strong: . . . "Annis aliquot ante quam Lutherana et Calviniana heresis oriretur, nulla ferme erat (ut ii testantur qui etiam tunc vivebant), nulla (inquam) prope erat in judiciis ecclesiasticis severitas, nulla in moribus disciplina, nulla in sacris literis eruditio, nulla in rebus divinis reverentia, nulla propemodum jam erat religio."

Of the condition of the English Church about 1512 (that is some years before the movement for reform initiated by Luther in Germany



had begun), there remains a remarkable description by Colet, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, in a sermon preached by him in that year before the Convocation of Canterbury—an audience to which it is most unlikely that any statement on the subject, if not well founded, would have been made: . . . “All,” he said, “that is in the Church is either the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, or the pride of life.” This assertion he proceeded to illustrate by referring to the solicitude of the clergy for secular offices, and their pursuit of pleasures. They gave themselves, he asserted, to feasts and banquetings; were addicted to hawking and hunting; covetous; seeking plurality of benefices, and necessarily neglecting them when they attained them. “We are,” he exclaimed, “troubled with heresies, but the heresies are not so pernicious to us and the people as the bad lives of the priests.” (See Appendix to Knight's *Life of Colet*; and see also Canon Perry's *History of the English Church*, vol. ii. p. 19.) With this sermon should be compared a Commission issued in 1455, by Archbishop Bourchier, “Ad reformandum crimina et excessus clericorum et laicorum dioceseos Cantuariensis,” and a pastoral of Archbishop Morton in 1486, “Epistola continens statuta de vitâ et moribus clericorum in provinciali synodo edita” (Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iii. pp. 573, 619).

In the case of the monks both upon the Continent and in England it is only necessary to refer to the writings of Erasmus in order to perceive how unfavourable were the notions respecting them prevalent in the beginning of the sixteenth century. A Bull issued by Pope Innocent VIII. (1489), *pro reformatione monasteriorum*, &c., would seem to show that they were complained of in England at a still earlier date. (Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iii. p. 631.)

The truth is that both in Germany and England at the era of the Reformation, the real question debated by those who then influenced public opinion was not whether reform was needed in the Churches connected with the See of Rome, but whether the reform in them which all desired should be accomplished, as Luther advocated with, or as Erasmus recommended without, separation from Rome.

## NOTE B. PAGE 20.

The *Life of Archbishop Browne*, referred to at page 20 note, *supra*, seems to have been composed by Robert Ware, son of Sir James Ware, from papers of his father. (See Ware's *Works*, Dublin, 1705, p. 150.)

It may be convenient to mention the editions from which Ware and other writers to whom there has been occasion frequently to refer in the present treatise are cited. Ware and the *Life of Browne* are cited from the Dublin edition of Ware's works, 1705. The works of Archbishop Ussher are cited from the edition in seventeen volumes, published by the University of Dublin (1847-1864). The life of Archbishop Ussher referred to is that by Rev. Dr. Elrington, contained in the same edition. The edition of Leland's *History of Ireland* used is the Dublin, in three volumes, octavo (1774); it is cited simply as "Leland." The edition of Swift's works cited is that edited by Sheridan. Sir John Davis's *Discovery*, &c., is cited from the Dublin edition, 1705; and Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, from the Clarendon Press edition. The work referred to as "Dr. Brady's *Succession*," is "The Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland, and Ireland, A.D. 1400 to 1875, with appointments to Monasteries," by W. Maziere Brady, published at Rome, 1876. Theiner's *Monumenta Vetera*, also containing records at Rome of Irish affairs, is cited as "Theiner." Calendars of the Patent and Close Rolls in Chancery in Ireland have been published for the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. They were edited by Mr. Morrin of the Irish Record Office, and are therefore referred to simply as "Morrin." The English State Papers were published by Royal Commission (1830-1852); they were edited by Mr. Lemon; vols. ii. and iii. (Part III.) relate to Ireland. There is also a Calendar of other State Papers relating to Ireland, marked by the years from 1509 to 1573. These are all referred to as "State Papers," or simply with the letters "S. P." Besides, there is also a Calendar of the Manuscripts of Sir George Carew, which are preserved in the library at Lambeth Palace; this is edited by Mr. Brewer. It is cited as "Carew MSS." The references to Richey are to the edition entitled, *A Short History of the Irish People*, Dublin, 1887, edited by Kane.

## NOTE C. PAGE 20.

The letter of Archbishop Browne to Thomas Cromwell, then Lord Privy Seal, written in September, 1535 (which is referred to at page 20, *supra*), is reported by Robert Ware, in the *Life of Archbishop Browne*, in the following words:—

“MY MOST HONOURED LORD,—Your most humble servant receiving your mandate, as one of his Highness’s Commissioners, hath endeavoured almost to the danger and hazard of this temporal life, to procure the nobility and gentry of this nation to due obedience, in owing of his Highness their supreme head as well spiritual as temporal, and do find much oppugning therein, especially by my brother Ardmagh, who hath been the main oppugner; and so hath withdrawn most of his suffragans and clergy within his See and jurisdiction; he made a speech to them, laying a curse on the people whosoever should own his Highness’s supremacy: saying that this isle, as it is in their Irish Chronicles, *insula sacra*, belongs to none but to the Bishop of Rome, and that it was the Bishop of Rome’s predecessors gave it to the King’s ancestors. There be two messengers by the priests of Ardmagh and by that Archbishop, now lately sent to the Bishop of Rome. Your Lordship may inform his Highness that it is convenient to call a Parliament in this nation to pass the Supremacy by Act; for they do not much matter his Highness’s Commission which your Lordship sent us over. This island hath been for a long time held in ignorance by the Romish Orders: and as for their secular orders, they be in a manner as ignorant as the people, being not able to say Mass, or pronounce the words, they not knowing what they themselves say in the Roman tongue. The common people of this isle are more zealous in their blindness than the Saints and Martyrs were in the truth at the beginning of the Gospel. I send to you, my very good Lord, these things, that your Lordship and his Highness may consult what is to be done. It is feared O’Neal will be ordered by the Bishop of Rome to oppose your Lordship’s order from the King’s Highness; for the natives are much in numbers within his power. I do pray the Lord Christ to defend your Lordship from your enemies. Dublin, 4 Kalend, Septembris, 1535.”

The topic which, according to this letter, Cromer used against the admission of the Supremacy of the Crown in the Irish Church, was more of a political than of an ecclesiastical character. It was founded



on peculiar circumstances connected with the invasion of Ireland by Henry II. Before that event this monarch, desirous of giving his enterprise a religious sanction, had obtained from Pope Adrian IV. (an Englishman by birth) a Bull, which directed the people of Ireland to receive Henry as their Lord, reserving, however, for St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church a yearly rent of one penny per house. (See Leland, vol. i. p. 8; Richey, p. 157; and Stokes' *Anglo-Norman Church*, p. 45.)

---

NOTE D. PAGE 21.

The twelve counties in Ireland, whose formation is attributed to King John, are by Sir John Davis, and, indeed, generally spoken of, as the counties existing at and before the Parliament of 1536. There appear, however, in ancient records beside these counties two small counties, Ards and Down, afterwards, under Queen Elizabeth, merged in Down. Connaught, also, and Ulster were, before these times, sometimes treated as each a county. Roscommon, also, is mentioned in old records. Tipperary, and, in some parliaments, other counties also, returned members as if subdivided, one part being called "the Cross," and the other "the Liberty." The latter was under the rule of some great Lord, with absolute power. Cross (*crocea*) seems so called because subject to ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

No particulars of the Parliament of 1536 are preserved. We have not the names of those who attended it. The first Parliament of whose members a list remains is the first of Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1560 (see note Q, *infra*). Between 1536 and 1560 there had been some additions to the number of counties, boroughs, and Temporal Peers. Allowing for them we may infer from comparison of the two Parliaments that in 1536 the number of the House of Commons did not reach 80: and that the Temporal Peers were not then 20. With respect to the Spiritual Peers Sir John Davis says that such Bishops as "were resident in the mere Irish countryes and did not acknowledge the Kinge to be their patron were never summoned to any Parliament;" but, after allowing for this, the Spiritual Peers must have been much more numerous than the Temporal, as besides Bishops there were the Superiors of Religious Houses.\*

---

\* Davis does not mention that any Superiors of Religious Houses sat in the Lords, but Ware does, and gives the names of the Houses, 24 in number (see Ware's *Annals*, p. 100).

According to Sir John Davis, in 1536, or at any time before 33rd Henry VIII. (A. D. 1541), only the English of blood, or English of birth, were admitted to Parliament in Ireland; as well, he says, because their districts were not then formed into counties, as that the State did not hold them fit to be "trusted with the counsell of the realm." (See Davis's speech referred to at p. 107, *supra*, Leland, vol. ii., p. 498).

---

NOTE E. PAGE 23.

The speech (mentioned at page 23) which Archbishop Browne is reported to have delivered in the Irish House of Lords, when he advocated before that assembly the Supremacy Act, is stated in Ware's *Life of Browne*. The report seems to be a summary. It is in the following words: . . . "My Lords and Gentry of this his Majesties realm of Ireland, Behold your obedience to your King is the observing of your God and Saviour Christ; for He, that High Priest of our souls, paid tribute to Cesar (though no Christian); greater honour surely is due to your Prince his Highness the King, and a Christian one: Rome and her Bishops in the Father's days acknowledged Emperors, Kings and Princes to be supreme over their dominions, nay, Christ's own Vicars; and it is much to the Bishop of Rome's shame, to deny what their precedent Bishops owned; therefore his Highness claims but what he can justify the Bishop Eleutherius gave to Lucius the first Christian King of the Britains; so that I shall without scrupling vote his Highness King Henry my supreme over ecclesiastical matters as well as temporal, and Head thereof, even of both isles England and Ireland, and that without guilt of conscience or sin to God; and he who will not pass this Act, as I do, is no true subject to his Highness."

The story, alluded to in this speech, of a correspondence between Lucius, or more properly Llewer Mawr, who was said to have been in the second century a King of the Britons, and Eleutherius, then Bishop of Rome, is considered legendary. In fact the genuineness of the letter to Eleutherius, which is attributed to Lucius, is disproved by internal evidence. (See Canon Perry's *History of the English Church*, first ser., p. 3.) In the sixteenth century the latter seems to have been reputed of authority.

Bishop Reeves, in addition to other valuable assistance contributed by him to the preparation of this treatise, has called my attention to a

citation of this correspondence by another Irish bishop of much later date than Browne. When Hampton, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh in the reign of James I., preached at Glasgow the sermon mentioned at page 118, *supra*, he referred to Eleutherius, and pointed out that according to him a King is God's lieutenant, vicar, and deputy, *vicarius Dei*.

---

## NOTE F. PAGE 24.

I had intended, as stated at p. 24, *supra*, to give in this note the Irish Supremacy Act of Henry VIII. (28 Henry VIII., ch. 5 (Ireland), A. D. 1537) in full; but this would require more space than can well be afforded: and on consideration there seems to be enough of the provisions of the statute extracted at pp. 23, 24, *supra*.

---

## NOTE G. PAGE 26.

The State Paper of 1515, referred to in the note at p. 26, *supra*, will be found in the Calendar of State Papers, tempore Henry VIII., vol. ii., p. 11. It relates to the country outside the Pale; and gives the names of 60 chief captains of Irish and 30 of English descent, who exercised dominion over it. The territories of the Irish are described as "sixty countryes called regions, inhabited by the King's Irish enemies: some regions being as big as a shire, and some a little less." "Every of the said captains," the paper proceeds, "liveth only by the sword, and obeyeth unto no other temporal person, but only to himself that is strong: and every of the said captains maketh war and peace for himself, and holdeth by the sword, and hath imperial jurisdiction within his room, and obeyeth to no other person, English nor Irish, except only to such persons as may subdue him by the sword." Under these chief captains there were said to be "divers petty captains, every of whom maketh war and peace for himself, without licence of the chief captain."

The 30 English captains are described as following the same Irish order as the Irish captains, and keeping the same rule, "every of them making war and peace for himself, without any licence of the King, or of any other temporal person, save to him that is strongest, and of such that may subdue them by the sword."

The same Paper states that the following counties obey not the King's law, and have neither justice nor sheriff under the King, viz. the counties



of Waterford, Cork, Kilkenny, Limerick, Kerry, and Carlow, the county of Connaught, the county of Ulster, half the county of Uriel (Louth), half the county of Meath, half the county of Dublin, half the county of Kildare, half the county of Wexford.

It is obvious that the subdivision of political power among so many absolute rulers outside the Pale presented insuperable hindrances to any social improvement. The people were wholly engaged either in actual wars between themselves or in making preparations for such wars. In the *Annals of the Four Masters* some notice of these may be found, and taking their account, which is principally occupied with Connaught and Ulster, there occurred (according to Mr. Richey's computation) between the years 1500 and 1534, 116 battles and plundering incursions. In the same time 102 Irish gentlemen of family were killed in battle, and 168 murdered, many of the last under circumstances of great atrocity. (See Richey's *History*, p. 247.)

Such constant wars, creating a general sense of insecurity, discouraged industry. Wholly occupying the attention of the native Irish, they prevented the introduction of civilization among them. Necessarily attended with expense, they increased the oppressive taxes which were levied upon the occupiers of land by the chiefs to maintain a sort of rude state. As might under these circumstances be expected, the country generally remained in a condition of poverty and barbarism.

What aspect it presented to a foreign visitor about 1517, may be seen in a Report made to Pope Leo X. of that date, still preserved in the Vatican Library. \* \* \* est (it proceeds) insula Hibernia; a Plinio autem Juverna appellata, dimidio minor, quam Britannia; hodie Irlandia a barbaris vocatur. Pars vero ipsius, quæ Angliæ proxima est, humanior; reliqua vero *ferino cultu*, ligneis ac stramineis tuguriis utens. Bona etiam pars simul pecore in campis ac cavernis; discalceati fere omnes, ac latrocinio dediti (*Theiner*, p. 521).

With reference to this period, and from thence to the death of Queen Elizabeth, I desire to refer my readers to Bagwell's *Tuāors in Ireland*, a work distinguished by research and impartiality.

---

NOTE H. PAGE 26.

The description of the State of the Pale in the reign of Henry VIII. given in the State Paper referred to in a note on page 26 is most unfavour-

able. According to it twenty miles in compass was the extent within which obedience to English laws, and conformity with English habits existed. It represents all the old exactions (coyne and livery, &c.) as being in the Pale in force. English settlers, it states, were discouraged, and Irish tenants, "which can live heartily without bread or other good victuals," and submit to impositions the English would not, were favoured. At the same time tributes were levied by the neighbouring Irish chieftains. The name, Pale—enclosure—the English enclosure, seems to have been introduced into use in the fifteenth century. Its limits in 1515 are described as on the East side of the coast from Dalkey, 8 miles below Dublin, to Dundalk, the chief town of the county Louth, about 50 miles above Dublin. From Dundalk to Ardee (still in Louth), thence to Kells (in Meath), thence to Kilcock (in Kildare), thence to Naas (in Kildare), and so under the Wicklow Mountains to Dalkey. (See Hardiman, *Preface to Statute of Kilkenny*, pp. xxv., xxviii.). These boundaries show that the Pale was then less than one-twentieth of the whole island.

---

NOTE I. PAGE 33.

Before the Supremacy Act of Henry VIII., although the English statutes against episcopal appointments by the Pope had, by an Irish Act of Henry VI. (32 Hen. VI. ch. 1), been made of force in Ireland, the Bishops were nominated at Rome: but with attention to the suggestions of the King, when he thought proper (as he generally did for the bishoprics of the Pale) to interfere. Thus, when Browne came to Ireland as Archbishop of Dublin, Cromer (Armagh), Staples (Meath), and Wellesley (Kildare)—the bishops of the other dioceses in the Pale—had been chosen by Henry.

After the Supremacy Act Henry, without any reference to Rome, appointed the following bishops: Devereux to Ferns (1539); Miagh, or Meagh to Kildare (1541); O'Heffernan to Emly (1543); Dowdall to Armagh (1543); O'Shiel, or O'Siaghal to Elphin (1544). Only in the case of Armagh the Pope made an appointment in opposition to that by Henry, viz. of Waucop, who never gained possession; he, however, attended the Council of Trent as Archbishop, signing himself "Arma-chanus."

The following appointments, made by the Pope after the Supremacy Act, were confirmed by Henry:—Of Geravan to Clonmacnois (1541);

Magennis to Down (1541); O'Cervellan to Clogher (1542). He also, in 1541, confirmed de Burgo in Clonfert, to which the Pope had appointed him before the Supremacy Act. Wall, on the death of Geravan, seems to have been appointed to Clonmacnois by the Pope without confirmation by Henry.

NOTE K. PAGE 36.

According to Ussher (*Works*, vol. iv. p. 275), before the twelfth century there were a variety of liturgical uses in Ireland; and then the Roman use was introduced.

In 1212 Henri de Loundres became Archbishop of Dublin. He erected the collegiate Church of St. Patrick, Dublin, into a cathedral, and directed the rules established in the Church of Sarum to be observed in this cathedral (Mason's *St. Patrick*, p. 6). It is very improbable that he would have required the Sarum use to be observed in the cathedral, and not also have required, or at least encouraged, its use in Dublin, and wherever else his jurisdiction extended.

NOTE L. PAGE 37.

The Irish Acts, similar to the English Acts of Appeals and First Fruits, were 28 Henry VIII. ch. 6 and ch. 14. The Irish Act of Faculties was 28 Henry VIII. ch. 19. It recited the English Act of Faculties, and then enacted that it should be of as good force and effect in Ireland as it was within the realm of England.

The English Statute of Edward VI. respecting the Prayer-book did not expressly mention Ireland. A previous Act, however, of the same King (1 Edward VI. ch. i. s. 7), directed the sacrament under both kinds of bread and wine to be delivered and ministered unto the people within the Church (*sic.*) of England and Ireland, and other the King's dominions.

NOTE M. PAGE 40.

The account of the proceedings of the assembly of the clergy, convened by Sir Anthony St. Leger in 1551, contained in Robert Ware's *Life of Archbishop Browne*, is as follows: . . . "Before proclamations



were issued out (*i.e.* proclamations to bring the new English Prayer-book into use), Sir Anthony St. Leger upon his (*i.e.* the King's) order called an assembly of the archbishops and bishops, together with other of the then clergy of Ireland, in which assembly he signified unto them as well His Majestie's order aforesaid, as also the opinions of those bishops and clergy of England who had adhered unto the order, saying that it was His Majestie's will and pleasure, consenting unto their serious considerations and opinions, then acted and agreed on in England as to ecclesiastical matters, that the same be in Ireland so likewise celebrated and performed." Ware then continues: . . . "Sir Anthony St. Leger having spoken to this effect, George Dowdall, who succeeded George Cromer in the primacy of Ardmagh, stood up, who (through his Romish zeal to the Pope) laboured with all his power and force to oppose the liturgy of the Church, that it might not be read or sung in the Church; saying, 'then shall every illiterate fellow read service (or mass), as he in those days termed the word 'service.' To this saying of the archbishop, Sir Anthony replied, 'No; your Grace is mistaken, for we have too many illiterate priests amongst us already, who neither can pronounce the Latin, nor know what it means, no more than the common people that hear them; but when the people hear the liturgy in English, they and the priest will then understand what they pray for.' Upon this reply, George Dowdall bade Sir Anthony beware of the clergie's curse. Sir Anthony made answer, 'I fear no strange curse, so long as I have the blessing of that Church which I believe to be the true one.' The archbishop again said, 'Can there be a truer Church than the Church of St. Peter, the Mother Church of Rome?' Sir Anthony returned this answer, 'I thought we had been all of the Church of Christ; for he calls all true believers in Him his Church, and Himself the Head thereof.' The archbishop replied, 'Is not St. Peter's the Church of Christ?' Sir Anthony returned the answer, 'St. Peter was a member of Christ's Church; but the Church was not St. Peter's; neither was St. Peter, but Christ the head thereof.' Then George Dowdall, the Primate of Ardmagh, rose up, and several of the suffragan bishops under his jurisdiction, saving only Edward Staples, then Bishop of Meath, who tarried with the rest of the clergy then assembled, on the kalends of March, according to the old style, 1551, but if we reckon as from the Annunciation of Our Lady, which was the 25th of March, it was 1550. Sir Anthony then took up the order, and held it forth to George Browne, Archbishop of Dublin, who (standing up) received it, saying, 'This order, good brethren,

is from our gracious King and from the rest of our brethren, the fathers and clergy of England, who have consulted herein and compared the Holy Scriptures with what they have done, unto whom I submit, as Jesus did to Cæsar, in all things just and lawful, making no question, why or wherefore, as we own him our true and lawful King.' After this, several of the meeker, or most moderate of the bishops and clergy of Ireland, cohered with George Browne, the Archbishop of Dublin, amongst whom Edward Staples, Bishop of Meath, who was put out from his bishopric for so doing in Queen Mary's days, on the 29th of June, 1554; John Bale, who on the 2nd of February, 1552, was consecrated Bishop of Ossory for his fidelity, and afterwards by Queen Mary expelled; also Thomas Lancaster, Bishop of Kildare, who was at the same time put from his bishopric, with several other of the clergy, being all expelled upon Queen Mary's coming to the Crown."

Of the three persons named by Ware as adhering to Browne two only were then bishops—Staples (Meath) who, under Henry VIII., took the side of the Reformation, and Lancaster (Kildare) appointed by Edward. Bale was appointed to Ossory a few months after this meeting; but he may then have been designed for that See. Beside Lancaster, Edward had before this meeting appointed another bishop—Travers—to Leighlin.

---

NOTE N. PAGE 53.

The records at Rome of appointments to Bishoprics in Ireland have been abstracted in Dr. Brady's *Episcopal Succession* (as to which see Note B). The entry of Curwin's appointment describes it as at the request of Philip and Mary—"pro quo Philippus Rex et Maria Regina Angliæ supplicaverunt." The same is said of the appointment of O'Fihil or Field. In Lacy's case the request is from Mary alone. His appointment at Rome is dated 24th November, 1556, and the Queen's letter, directing the patent for his office to issue, is 6th December, 1556. Lacy had to take an oath that he held the temporal possessions from the Queen. There appear to be no entries at Rome as to Thonery or Le Baron.

---

NOTE O. PAGE 55.

The narrative, given in Robert Ware's *Life of Archbishop Browne*, of a Commission having been sent by Queen Mary "to call the

Protestants in question" in Ireland, and of the abstraction of it from the messenger at Chester (see page 55, *supra*), is in the following words:—"Queen Mary, towards the end of her reign, granted a Commission to call the Protestants in question here in Ireland, as well as they had done in England; and to execute the same with greater force, she nominated Dr. Cole, sometime Dean of St. Paul's in London, one of the Commissioners; and so sent the Commission by this said doctor; and in his journey coming to Chester, the mayor of that city, hearing that Her Majesty was sending Commissioners into Ireland, and he being a churchman, waited on the doctor, who in discourse with the mayor took out of his cloak-bag a leather box, and said unto him, 'Here is a Commission that shall lash the heretics of Ireland,' calling the Protestants by that title. The good woman of the house being well affected to the Protestants and to that religion, and also having a brother named John Edmonds, a Protestant, and a citizen in Dublin, was much troubled at the doctor's words; but she, waiting her convenient time, whilst the mayor took leave of the doctor, and the doctor complimenting him down the stairs, she opened the box and took the Commission out, and placed in lieu thereof a pack of cards, with the knave of clubs faced uppermost, and wrapt them up. The doctor coming up to his chamber, suspecting nothing of what had been done, put up his box as formerly. The next day going to the water-side, wind and weather serving him, he sailed towards Ireland, and landed on the 17th October, 1558, at Dublin; then coming to the Castle, the Lord Fitz-Walters, being at this time Lord Deputy, sent for the doctor to come before him and the Privy Council, who coming in, after he had made a speech relating upon what account he came over, presented the box to the Lord Deputy, who causing it to be opened, that the secretary might read the Commission, there appeared nothing save a pack of cards, with the knave of clubs uppermost; which not only startled the Lord Deputy and the Council, but the doctor, who assured them he had a Commission, but knew not how it was gone. Then the Lord Deputy made answer, 'Let us have another Commission, and we will shuffle the cards in the meanwhile.' The doctor, being troubled in his mind, went away, and returned into England, and coming to the Court, obtained another Commission; but staying for a wind at the water-side, news came to him that the Queen was dead. Thus God preserved the Protestants in Ireland from the persecution intended."

Ware refers to Boyle, the celebrated Earl of Cork, and Primates Henry and James Ussher, as authorities for this narrative. He also says



that Queen Elizabeth gave the woman who abstracted the Commission a pension of £40 a-year. A similar statement will be found in Sir Richard Cox's *History*; but it seems to be by him derived from Ware.

Among the Carew MSS. Mr. Bagwell has found a passage in "instructions from Philip and Mary to the Lord Deputy, 28th April, 1556," which, in addition to the circumstantiality with which the story has been told, tends to confirm its credibility . . . "Lord Cardinal Poole, being sent unto us from the Pope's Holiness, and the said See Apostolic, Legate of our said realm, mindeth in brief time to despatch into Ireland certain his Commissioners and officials to visit the clergy and other members of the said realm of Ireland."—*Ireland under the Tudors*, vol. i. p. 413, *note*.

It will be observed that this extract tends to confirm the supposition referred to at page 55, *supra*, that if the Commission was sent, it originated in England, without suggestion from anyone in Ireland.

---

NOTE P. PAGE 64.

In considering the question of the Supremacy of the Crown in the Church of England, it is necessary to keep in mind that the statutes of Henry, in which the King was described as "Head of the Church of England," were repealed by an Act of Philip and Mary; and that (with one exception) they were not expressly revived by the Act of Elizabeth. The exception is an Act entitled, "A Bill that Doctors of the Civil Law, being married, may exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction" (37 Henry VIII., ch. 17). This was probably owing to Queen Elizabeth's objection to being called "Supreme Head of the Church" (see page 62, *supra*).

In Queen Elizabeth's Acts there is not any title defining the ecclesiastical position of the Crown, except in the Oath of Supremacy, and there the title is, "Supreme Governor of this realm, and of all other Her Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporals." But the title "Supreme Head of the Church," is, nevertheless, given to the Sovereign by legal writers as a title which the Crown by the common law possesses. Thus Blackstone says, "the King is considered by the laws of England as the head and supreme governor of the National Church."—Book i. ch. 7.

Beside the support which the declaratory form of the Act of Henry VIII. (framed not as if enacting a new law, but as if declaring an existing law) gave to the idea that the common law asserted the supremacy,

there is an express decision of the English judges in its favour. In *Caudrey's Case*, reported by Lord Coke (5 Rep.)—a case which, although later in date than Queen Elizabeth's Supremacy Act, came to be decided on the common law, not on statutable law—it was resolved that “by the ancient laws of this realm, this kingdom of England is an absolute empire and monarchy consisting of one head, which is the King, and of a body politic, compact and compounded of many, and almost infinite several, and yet well-agreeing members: all which the law divideth into two several parts, that is to say, the clergy and the laity both of them, next and immediately under God, subject and obedient to the head: also the head is instituted and furnished with plenary and entire power, prerogative, and jurisdiction, to render justice and right to every part and member of this body, of what estate, degree, or calling soever, in all causes ecclesiastical or temporal; otherwise he should not be a head of the whole body.”

The judgment in *Caudrey's Case* professes to found itself upon a series of authorities which commence with words in the laws of Edward the Confessor that describe the King as *vicarius summi regis* (see page 12, *supra*, note), and are continued through the various English statutes, which restrained the Papal authority in England (see page 10, *supra*).

In order, however, accurately to ascertain what legally is meant by the Supremacy of the Crown in the English Church, it is necessary to consider not only the Supremacy statutes of Henry and Elizabeth in conjunction with the judgment in *Caudrey's Case*, but also Article XXXVII. of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; for the Articles are of later date than these statutes and judgment, and being by an Act of Parliament (13 Eliz. ch. 12) required to be subscribed by the clergy, they must be held to have had parliamentary sanction.

The language of Article XXXVII. has been cited at page 63, *supra*, and upon referring to it there will be seen a distinct repudiation of the notion that a spiritual character is claimed by the Supremacy. How clearly this was from the time of the enactment of the Article understood, was manifested in the next reign by the language of Bishop Andrews in his answer to Cardinal Bellarmine, written at the request of James I. (of all the English Kings the least likely to yield a prerogative authority if the law gave it)—*nihil ille (rex) sibi, nihil nos illi fas putamus attingere, quæ ad sacerdotale munus spectant, seu potestatem ordinis consequuntur.* (See the entire passage from which this extract is taken in Wordsworth's *Christian Institutes*, vol. iii. pp. 45–7.)

It is also to be noted that the language of the Article (XXXVII.) merely speaks for "the realm of England and other her Majesty's dominions." It states, not a theological dogma, but an explanation of the nature of an authority whose existence had been previously asserted by the English Parliament in declaratory statutes. With respect to the foundation upon which such an authority is to rest, there is no reason to think that either those who framed or those who enacted the Article would have dissented from the words used by Hooker at a somewhat later date: . . . "As for supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs, the Word of God doth nowhere appoint that all Kings should have it, neither that any should not have it; for which cause it seemeth to stand altogether by human right, that unto Christian Kings there is such dominion given" (Keble's *Hooker's Works*, 4th edition, vol. iii. p. 345).

Article XXXVII. has been retained without alteration by the disestablished Church of Ireland. In the Articles of the Episcopal Church of the United States the following words have been substituted for the English Article XXXVII.: . . . "The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men as well clergy as laity, in all things temporal; but hath no authority in things purely spiritual. And we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the Gospel to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority, regularly and legitimately constituted."

---

NOTE Q. PAGES 68, 70.

In the instance of the Parliament of 1560 a record is preserved which states the persons of whom it was composed. Of the subsequent meeting of the bishops and clergy called by Sussex, the accounts remaining are of a less satisfactory character.

The Record of the Parliament is in the Record Office, Dublin, and has been printed in the Appendix to Hardiman's edition of the *Statutes of Kilkenny* (Ir. Arch. Soc., Tracts, ii. 134-8). This record professes to give—nomina Dominorum spiritualium et temporalium ac Communium in parlamento summonito et tento xi<sup>o</sup> die Januarii anno regni Elizabethæ secundo. The titles of twenty-three Temporal Lords are stated. The Domini Spirituales, whose titles are enumerated, are twenty in number, viz.:—Hugo Dublin., Hiberniæ Primas, Dominus Canc.; Rolandus Cassil.; Chris. Tuam.; Wilhelmus Midensis; Patr. Wat. and Lismor.; Rogerus Corc. et Clon.; Alexander Fern.; Thomas Darensis (*i.e.* Kildare); Thomas Leghlin.; Johannes Ossorien.; [—] Imolacensis (Emly); Hugo



Lymericen.; Rolandus Clonfert. et Elph.; Eugenius Dunen. (Down); Eps. Rossensis; Eps. Laonensis (Killaloe); Eps. Coranensis (Achonry); Eps. Aladensis (Killala); Eps. Ardfertensis; Eps. Ardacadensis (Ardagh).

It will be observed that thirteen, or if the Christian name has been obliterated before Emly fourteen, bishops had both their Christian names and their titles stated; and that the rest were described only with their titles. It has been suggested, and is probable, that the former were those present—the latter, though summoned, not attending, nor perhaps known with certainty.

The *Communes* are set out in the following manner. Under the head of *Milites* the names of twenty counties are given, followed by the names of twenty-nine boroughs and cities; in the case of ten counties and twenty-eight cities and boroughs, the names of members (two for each) are appended. The ten counties, the names of whose members are recorded, are Dublin, Meath, Westmeath, Louth, Kildare, Catherlow, Kilkenny, Waterford, Tipperary, Wexford. The ten counties which are mentioned, but without any notice of members returned from them, are Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Connaught, Clare, Antrim, Ardes, Down, King's County, Queen's County. It is not probable that any members attended, or indeed were returned from these.

Mr. Bagwell thinks the persons attending the House of Lords for this Parliament were three Archbishops, seventeen Bishops, and twenty-three temporal Peers. (*Ireland under the Tudors*, vol. ii., p. 6.)

There appears to have been division of opinion among both Peers and Commoners, which led Sussex to go to England to consult the Queen before further proceeding (see Ware). He came back with the title not of Deputy, but of Lord Lieutenant; and it was after his return that the meeting of bishops and clergy was held. Ware's account of the meeting is that within three weeks after Sussex's return, "came letters from her Majesty to him, signifying her pleasure for a general meeting of the clergy of Ireland, and the establishment of the Protestant religion through the several dioceses of the kingdom. Among bishops, William Walsh, then Bishop of Meath, was very zealous for the Romish Church; not content with what offers her Majesty had proposed, but very much enraged (after the assembly had dispersed themselves), he fell to preach against the Common Prayer (in his diocese at Trim), which was newly come over, and ordered to be observed; for which the Lord Lieutenant confined him, till he acquainted her Majesty with it, who sent over her orders to clap him up in prison." (*Annals*, A. D. 1559.)

The account of the meeting in the Loftus MSS. in Marsh's Library, Dublin, is . . . "1560—This year was held a convocation of bishops, at the Queen's command, for establishing the Protestant religion, but William Walsh, Bishop of Meath, would not conform thereunto, but for practising against it was committed to custody, afterwards imprisoned, and at length deprived of his bishoprick."

---

NOTE R. PAGE 73.

The conduct of the bishops, who held office in Ireland at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, in relation to the ecclesiastical changes then made, has been a subject of controversy (see pamphlets by Dr. Maziere Brady, on one side, and on the other by Archdeacon Lee, and Dr. Alfred Lee, published in Dublin and London in 1866-7). In considering the evidence bearing upon the question, the distinction between external conformity and genuine loyalty to the new religious system (pointed out at p. 71, *supra*), is to be kept in mind. With respect to the former, the case upon the imperfect evidence connected with the subject which remains seems to me to stand thus:—

Assuming the validity of Queen Mary's deprivations and appointments, the bishoprics were at her death circumstanced as follows: (1) Armagh was vacant. The others were filled (2) Dublin by Curwin; (3) Cashel by Fitzgerald, *alias* Le Baron; (4) Tuam by Bodkin; (5) Meath by William Walsh; (6) Down and Connor by Magennis; (7) Kildare by Leverous; (8) Ossory by Thonery; (9) Ferns by Devereux; (10) Leighlin by Field, or O Fihell; (11) Waterford and Lismore by Patrick Walsh; (12) Limerick by Lacy; (13) Cork and Cloyne by Skiddy; (14) Clonfert by Roland de Burgo; (15) Emly by another de Burgo; (16) Killaloe by O'Brien; (17) Killala by O'Gallagher; (18) Ardfert by Fitz Maurice; (19) Ardagh by MacMahon; (20) Clogher by O'Cervellan; (21) Clonmacnois by Wall; (22) Kilmore seems vacant; (23) Dromore, if full, was filled by Magennis *in commendam* with Down; (24) Derry by O'Doherty; (25) Raphoe by O'Gallagher; (26) Kilfenora by O'Kielan or O'Hinalam.

Of these Bodkin, Magennis, Devereux, De Burgo (Clonfert), O'Cervellan, were either appointed or confirmed by Henry VIII., and they had continued under both Edward VI. and Mary. Patrick Walsh was appointed by Edward VI. and continued under Mary. None of them ever showed any tendency to act against what was, for the time being,

approved by the State. In the instance of Magennis it is to be added that he acted at the consecration (according to the new service) of Goodacre and Bale, appointed by Edward VI. (see p. 45, *supra*).

Thirteen, or probably fourteen, of the twenty-five bishops have their Christian names given in the list of, and may be presumed to have attended, the Parliament of 1560 (see Note Q), which enacted Elizabeth's Prayer-book and the Act of Supremacy. For objecting to the latter, Walsh, and for objecting to both, Leverous, were deprived. It is unlikely that, if the others had acted similarly, there would not have been more removals.

In the case of two of the bishops—Curwin and Field—conformity is admitted. "None" (says Sussex, writing to Cecil of Curwin) "of his cote hath surlyest stood to the Crown either in England or Ireland" (*Shirley*, p. 94). Field in 1559 took the oath of allegiance and subjection (*Shirley*, p. 93, and *Cal. S. P. El.*, p. 154); and in 1564 he was named upon a commission to inquire into heretical opinions and other ecclesiastical offences. Others of the bishops were on commissions for the purposes of the State, viz. Fitzgerald "Le Baron," 1560 (*Morrin*, vol. i., p. 433), Bodkin, 1567 (*Morrin*, vol. i., p. 505), Devereux, 1559, 1562-3 (*Morrin*, vol. i., pp. 412, 477), Patrick Walsh, 1566 (*Cal. S. P.* 320). Lacy was removed in 1571, but had before been named on commissions, 1560, 1564, 1568 (*Morrin*, vol. i., pp. 433, 492, and *Cal. S. P. El.* 360). In his case it may have been that he complied until Elizabeth, in 1570, was excommunicated. Leverous and Thonery, not Protestant, were at first named in commissions (*Morrin*, vol. i., p. 412). Those who acted on commissions were legally bound to take the Oath of Supremacy (2 *Eliz. ch. i. s. 7*).

But, independent of what was done in the case of commissions, Elizabeth, in the first years of her reign, generally required the Oath of Supremacy to be taken in Ireland by bishops, and her doing so was complained of in the Roman Catholic accounts of the period. Thomas Rothe, Bishop of Ossory, in the next reign, says . . . *quisquis refugeret illud (juramentum) suscipere ex toto cuneo prelatorum statim excideret a sua dignitate et prelatura*. The same writer records that when Leverous refused to acknowledge the Supremacy, Sussex reproached him with the number of doctors and bishops (of course referring also to England) who had recognized it—*quorsum negaret reginam esse caput ecclesiæ, quod tamen recognoscebant tot magni et illustres viri, tot doctores et præsules in Anglia quam in ipsa Hibernia*.



Under these circumstances a suggestion made during the controversy referred to at the beginning of this note (but not, it seems to me, subsequently persevered in, see 4th edition of Dr. Brady's pamphlet)—that Curwin could not have obtained the assistance of two other bishops for the consecration of the ecclesiastics appointed by Queen Elizabeth immediately after her accession—seems to me quite untenable. By the Act which enabled the Queen to appoint by patent to bishoprics it was provided that any appointment by her should be signified to one archbishop and two bishops, or to four bishops, who were then to consecrate under pain of the penalties imposed by the English *premunire* statute, *i. e.* loss of goods, office, &c. (2 Eliz. ch. 4, ss. 2, 3, 5), and these it is most unlikely that any bishop would, by refusing to consecrate, incur.

In connexion with this topic it deserves to be noted that, in Bramhall's time, the due consecration of the Irish bishops under Elizabeth was assumed to be a certain fact; so much so, that Bramhall uses the assumption to show that Elizabeth's English consecrations must have been regular so far as the number of consecrating bishops, for otherwise they would have been supplied from Ireland. "If," he says, "it had been needful they might have had seven more out of Ireland—archbishops and bishops. For such a work as a consecration Ireland never wanted store of ordainers; nor ever yet did any man assert the want of a competent number of consecrators to an Irish Protestant bishop. They who concurred freely in the consecration of Protestant bishops at home would not have denied their concurrence in England if they had been commanded." (Bramhall's *Works*, Ang. Cath. Lib., vol. ii., p. 52.)

---

NOTE S. PAGE 74.

The double episcopal succession in Ireland—one line of bishops being nominated by the Crown, the other line by the Popes—seems to have commenced from the very beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign. The See of Armagh was at her accession vacant, for the rival claimants, Dowdall, Waucop, and Goodacre (see p. 39, 45, *supra*) had all previously died; and while Elizabeth appointed Loftus, the Pope provided O'Teige.

The succession of bishops appointed by the Crown will be found in Cotton's *Fasti Ecclesiæ Hibernicæ*; and of bishops appointed by the Popes, in Dr. Brady's *Episcopal Succession*. The last preceding note (R), gives

the names of bishops in office at Queen Elizabeth's accession. The following table gives the names of all appointed by her, or by the Popes, during her reign (1558-1603), together with the occasions when Sees were left vacant, as they appear in the foregoing works:—

## SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.

<i>Appointed by the Crown.</i>		<i>Appointed by the Popes.</i>	
<b>ARMAGH :—</b>			
Vacant, . . . .	1558	Vacant, . . . .	1558
Loftus, . . . .	1563	O'Teige, . . . .	1560
Lancaster, . . . .	1568	Creagh, . . . .	1564
Long, . . . .	1584	Mac Gauran, . . . .	1587
Garvey, . . . .	1589	Lombard, . . . .	1601
Ussher (Henry), . . . .	1595		
<b>CLOGHER :—</b>			
Vacant by death of } O'Cervallan. }	Not certain.	Vacant by deprivation or repu- } diation of O'Cervallan, }	Not certain.
Miler Magrath, . . . .	1570	Mac Mahon, . . . .	1546
On his translation to Cashel, } vacant (but he may have } kept possession). }	1571	Mercadell, . . . .	1560
		Mathews, . . . .	1609
<b>MEATH :—</b>			
Hugh Brady, . . . .	1563	Vacant by death of Walsh, . . . .	1577
Thomas Jones, . . . .	1584	Vicars-Apostolic, 1577 to Queen's death.	
<b>CLONMACNOIS :—</b>			
On first vacancy united to Meath, . . . .	1568	Vicars-Apostolic, 1568 to Queen's death.	
<b>KILMORE :—</b>			
Vacant, . . . .	1560	O'Sheridan, . . . .	1560
Garvey, . . . .	1585	Brady, . . . .	1580
Vacant, . . . .	1589	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . .	1607-1625
		O'Reilly, . . . .	1625
<b>ARDAGH :—</b>			
Vacant, . . . .	1558	Brady, . . . .	1576
Farrell, . . . .	1583	Mac Gauran, . . . .	1581
		Vicars-Apostolic, 1587 to Queen's death.	
<b>DOWN AND CONNOR :—</b>			
Vacant, . . . .	1564	Miler Magrath, . . . .	1565
Merriman, . . . .	1569	O'Gallagher, . . . .	1580
Allen, . . . .	1573	O'Devany . . . .	1582
Vacant, . . . .	1582		
Edgeworth, . . . .	1593		
Charden, . . . .	1596		
Humpston, . . . .	1602		
<b>DROMORE :—</b>			
Vacant, . . . .	1576	Maceual, . . . .	1576
		On his death, Vicars, . . . .	Date uncertain.

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS—*continued.*

<i>Appointed by the Crown.</i>		<i>Appointed by the Popes.</i>	
DERRY :—			
Vacant, . . . . .	1551	O'Gallagher, . . . . .	1569
		Vicars-Apostolic, 1601 to Queen's death.	
RAPHOE :—			
Vacant, . . . . .	1561	Mac Congail . . . . .	1562
		O'Boyle, . . . . .	1591
DUBLIN :—			
Loftus, . . . . .	1567	Oviedo,* . . . . .	1600
KILDARE :—			
Craik, . . . . .	1560	Not vacant till 1577 by Leverous's	
Daly, . . . . .	1564	death.	
Neylan, . . . . .	1583	Vicars-Apostolic, 1577 to Queen's death.	
OSSORY :—			
Gafney, . . . . .	1567	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	1567-1582
Walsh, . . . . .	1577	Strong, . . . . .	1582
Horsfall, . . . . .	1586	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	1602-1618
FERNS :—			
Devereux, . . . . .	1566	Power, . . . . .	1582
Allen, . . . . .	1582	Vicars-Apostolic, 1587 to Queen's death.	
Grave (with Leighlin), . . . . .	1600		
Stafford, Do. . . . .	1601		
LEIGHLIN :—			
Cavanagh, . . . . .	1567	Ophily, . . . . .	Date uncertain.
Meredyth, . . . . .	1589	De Ribera, . . . . .	1587
United with Ferns, . . . . .	1600		
CASHEL [AND EMLY] :—			
M'Caghwell, . . . . .	1567	Mac Gibbon, . . . . .	1567
Magrath, . . . . .	1571	Vacant, . . . . .	1578
		O'Hurley, . . . . .	1581
		Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	1584
		Kearney, . . . . .	1603
EMLY :—			
United with Cashel, . . . . .	1568	Vacant, . . . . .	1562
		MacBrien, . . . . .	1567
		Vicars-Apostolic, 1586 to Queen's death.	
WATERFORD AND LISMORE :—			
Middleton, . . . . .	1579	Vacant, . . . . .	1578
Magrath, . . . . .	1583	Vicars-Apostolic, 1578 to Queen's death.	
Weatherhad, . . . . .	1589		
Magrath, . . . . .	1592		

\* Brady mentions that Oviedo's appointment refers to one Donaldus as preceding him. This seems the only mention of the latter.



SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS—*continued.**Appointed by the Crown.**Appointed by the Popes.*

## CORK AND CLOYNE :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1566	Landes, . . . . .	1568
Dixon, . . . . .	1570	Tanner, . . . . .	1574
Sheyn, . . . . .	1572	M'Craghe, . . . . .	1580
United with Ross, . . . . .	1583	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	Date uncertain.

## ROSS :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1570	O'Hea, . . . . .	1559
Lyon (with Cork and Cloyne), . . . . .	1583	O'Herlihy, . . . . .	1561
		Nacten, . . . . .	1582
		Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	Date uncertain.

## LIMERICK :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1571	O'Buyll, . . . . .	1582
Casey restored, . . . . .	1571		
Thornburgh, . . . . .	1593		

## ARDFERT [AND AGHADOE] :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1583	Fitz Walter, . . . . .	1591
Kenan, . . . . .	1588	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	Date uncertain.
Crosby, . . . . .	1600		

## KILLALOE :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1569	Vacant, . . . . .	1555
O'Brien, . . . . .	1570	O'Molony, . . . . .	1571
		Ryan, . . . . .	1576

## KILFENORA :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1569	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	1572 to Queen's death.
-------------------	------	-----------------------------	------------------------

## TUAM :—

Mullaly or Laly, . . . . .	1573	Skerrett, . . . . .	1580
Donnellan, . . . . .	1595	Vacant, . . . . .	1583
		O'Higgin, . . . . .	1586
		Hely, . . . . .	1591

## KILLALA :—

Vacant, . . . . .	1585	Icahasay or Case, . . . . .	1580
O'Connor, . . . . .	1591	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	Date uncertain.

## ACHONRY :—

Vacant, . . . . .	—	O'Harte, . . . . .	1562
		Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	1603–1641

## ELPHIN :—

Chester, . . . . .	1580	O'Crian, . . . . .	1562
Lynch, . . . . .	1584	Healey, . . . . .	Date uncertain.
		Galvirius, . . . . .	Date uncertain.

## CLONFERT :—

Kirwan, . . . . .	1582	Farrell, . . . . .	1587
Lynch, . . . . .	1601	Vicars-Apostolic, . . . . .	1602 to Queen's death.

## KILMACDUAGH :—

Kirwan, . . . . .	1573	O'Molony, . . . . .	1576
Vacant, . . . . .	1582		
Lynch, . . . . .	1587		

If we examine this table we find that neither the succession of appointments by Elizabeth, nor the succession of appointments by the Popes, is filled with strict or uninterrupted regularity. The failure in the former was caused by the disturbed or disloyal state of large portions of the island (see p. 81, *supra*). The failure in the latter by the laws prohibiting appointments being made from Rome, or being acted upon if made, under the penalties of the English statutes against provisors (enacted for Ireland by 32 Henry VI., ch. 1, Irish), which, in the Pale and the dioceses near it, the Irish Government could enforce.

---

NOTE T. PAGE 88.

The dioceses of Ireland, as anciently constituted, were thirty-five in number:—Armagh, Clogher, Down, Connor, Derry, Raphoe, Kilmore, Dromore, situate in the northern parts of the island; Dublin, Glendalough, Kildare, Meath, Clonmacnois, Ferns, Leighlin, Ossory, situate in the province of Leinster; Cashel, Emly, Waterford, Lismore, Cork, Cloyne, Ross, Limerick, Ardfert, Aghadoe, situate in the southern parts of the island; Killaloe, Kilfenora, Kilmaeduaigh, Clonfert, Killala, Achonry, Tuam, Elphin, and Ardagh, situate towards the west. The Pale lay in the dioceses of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, and Armagh; only a small part being in Armagh. Clonmacnois was in the part of the county of Meath (which was afterwards Westmeath) outside the Pale, and in the King's County.

Before 1536, when Henry VIII. summoned Parliament to legislate for the Irish Church, the following Sees had been permanently united, viz. the See of Dublin with Glendalough, of Down with Connor, of Ardfert with Aghadoe, of Waterford with Lismore.

At that time four of the Irish Sees were Archbishoprics, viz. Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. The first and third had been such from a remote date: Dublin and Tuam not until about twenty years before the Invasion of Henry II., when Cardinal Paparo was sent over from Rome to confer Palls (the insignia of an archbishop) on the incumbents of those Sees, along with the incumbents of Armagh and Cashel. Then, too, at a Synod held at Kells, the province of each Archbishopric was defined.

Between 1536 and the Temporalities Acts (1833 and 1834) there were unions permanently or accustomably of Emly with Cashel, Clonmacnois with Meath, Ferns with Leighlin, Clonfert with Kilmaeduaigh, Killala with Achonry, Limerick with Ardfert and Aghadoe, and Cork with Ross.

(See Report of Church Commission, 1833). The effect of the Temporalities Acts in further uniting and otherwise altering the arrangements of bishoprics will be found at p. 289, *supra*.

Among the Sees of the Irish Church Armagh was from a remote date conceded the Primacy. It is claimed for it in the "Book of Armagh," a MS. of the ninth century: and Bishop Reeves has found even older authorities in its favour. (See Report of Royal Commission, 1868, App. p. 99.) "Armagh," he says, "owed its dignity to the supposed choice of St. Patrick, which again may have been influenced by its proximity to Emania, the ancient capital of Ulster." Among the suffragan bishoprics Meath had precedence: it does not appear why. Ware merely says that Meath was formed, not long after the coming of the English, out of the old Sees of Clonard, Kells, and Duleek, and that in the order of sitting among the suffragan bishops of Ireland in councils and elsewhere the Bishop of Meath had the first place, the Bishop of Derry the second, and the rest took their places according to the time of their ordination.\*—(*Antiquities*).

---

NOTE U. PAGE 88.

The payment in Ireland of tithes of cattle, corn, and other produce was enjoined at the Synod of Cashel, A.D. 1172. This Synod was convened by Henry II. immediately after his Invasion. Its decrees were afterwards confirmed, and probably previously influenced by him, with the object of bringing the Irish ecclesiastical rights and usages into conformity with those of the English Church (see page 36, *supra*, note). Long before that time the render of tithes, originally in England mere voluntary offerings, which the example of the Mosaic Dispensation suggested to be proper from the laity to the clergy, had there become compulsory and enforced by law. But in Ireland it is doubtful whether, until the Synod of Cashel, payment of tithes was either as a legal obligation or a religious duty usual. The opinion of recent writers

---

\* The question of the precedence of the Diocese of Meath has since Disestablishment been raised, and the precedence was affirmed by the Court of the General Synod. The rank of the bishopric was probably due to the rank of Meath among the old Irish kingdoms. Whether Derry is entitled to the second place is more doubtful. Some think Derry is by mistake substituted for Kildare, owing to the similarity of their Latin names, which are—for the former *Derensis* and for the latter *Darensis*.



seems to be that it was not. (See the *History* of Professor Carew of Maynooth, p. 149, and *Essays on the Irish Church*, London, 1866, by Protestant authors, pp. 131, 132, 159).

NOTE V. PAGE 89.

Ware gives a list of the monasteries and convents that were founded, exclusive of those which, having been erected in the first times of the Irish Church, had been afterwards converted into parish churches. The religious houses enumerated by him number 362, of which 142 were in Leinster, 90 in Munster, 82 in Connaught, and 48 in Ulster. (See *Antiquities*, Dublin edition, 1705.) Harris, in his edition of Ware, increases the number.

The Augustinian Order (whether called from St. Augustine or from a monk named Augustine to whom their discipline was due), including the Aroasians, seem to have had the largest number of these houses; the Cistercians owned some of the greatest, as Mellifont, near Drogheda, and Holy Cross, in Tipperary. The Mendicant Orders had a considerable number. At Kilmainham and Clontarf were great establishments of the Hospitallers, or Knights of St. John.

The utility of these institutions for social purposes in Ireland had not ceased before the reign of Henry VIII. On this ground the Irish Council petitioned the King that six of them (one being a nunnery) might be spared. They point out that "in default of inns, which are not in this land, the council and officers, also Irishmen and others resorting to the king's deputy, are most commonly lodged in them at the cost of the said houses, and that in them young men and children, both gentlemen's children and others, both of mankind and womankind, be brought up in virtue, learning, and in the English tongue and behaviour, to the great charges of the said houses." (*S. P.*, Ireland, vol. iii. p. 130.)

NOTE W. PAGE 90.

In the State Paper of 1515, which has been already referred to in Note G of Appendix, there is the following account of the Irish clergy:—"There is no archbishop nor bishop, abbot nor prior, parson or vicar, nor any other person of the Church, high or low, great or small, English or

Irish, that useth to preach the Word of God, saving the poor friar beggars." . . . "The Church of this land use not to learn any other science but the law of Canon (*i. e.* Canon Law) for covetyce of lucre transitory: all other science whereof grows none such lucre the parsons of the Church doth despise. They hold more by the plough rustical than by lucre of the plough celestial, to which they have stretched their hands and look always backwards. They tend much more to lucre of that plough whereof grows slander and rebuke than to lucre of the souls—that is, the plough of Christ."

With this account may be compared the following extract from a letter of Inge, Archbishop of Dublin, and of Chief Justice Birmingham to Wolsey (1528):—"Your Grace, we doubt not, heareth the sorrowful decay of this land, as well in good Christiantie as other laudable manners, which hath grown for lack of good prelates and curates in the Church" (curates used in the same sense as in the Collect for bishops and curates). "The diocese of Meath" (the most civilized in Ireland) they afterwards say "is far in ruin, both spiritually and temporally, by the absence of the bishop there." (*S. P. ii.*, pt. 3, 126.)

Archbishop Browne, in his letter of September, 1535 (Appendix C.), draws a distinction between the monks and the clergy in Ireland. The former, he says, "keep the people in ignorance; the latter are as ignorant as the people, being not able to say Mass, or pronounce the words, they not knowing what they themselves say in the Roman tongue."

Again, in a later letter to Cromwell, Browne says:—"Those of the clergy as your Lordship had from me before, being ignorant and not able to speak the right words in the Mass or Liturgie; a bird may be taught to speak with as much sense as several of them." (*Ware's Life of Browne*, Letter 3 Kal. Apr. 1538).

In articles exhibited by Lord Kildare against Lord Ormonde, the former says of the churches situated in the counties Kilkenny and Tipperary, that no Divine Service was kept there. . . . "If the King do not provide a remedy, there will be no more Christentie than in the middle of Turkey." (*Cal. Carew MSS.*, vol. i., p. 23.) In addition to these citations others collected by Mr. Bagwell (*Ireland under the Tudors*, vol. i., pp. 296-8) should be consulted. (See also in the same reference an account of the neglect of the buildings, &c., and compare as to Clonmacnois Cathedral a report to the Pope in 1515, *Carew MSS.*, vol. i., p. 491, and as to Ardagh Cathedral a description in the Report to Leo X. cited in Note G.)

The favourable estimate of the Begging Friars in the State Paper of 1515 is not confirmed by Ussher and Bedell, speaking of them at a later date; and previously in the fourteenth century severe charges were brought against them by Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh. (See Ussher's *Works*, vol. iv. p. 302, Mant's *History*, vol. i. p. 436).

---

NOTE X. PAGE 91.

With regard to the moral conduct of the Religious Orders in Ireland in the time of Henry VIII. historians are divided in opinion. They all admit that there were instances of delinquency (see these as enumerated by Dr. Killen and Mr. Bagwell). But the question is as to the general character. Respecting this Dr. Killen, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. pp. 336–9, has expressed an unfavourable opinion; Mr. Richey takes the other side. Mr. Bagwell refuses to pronounce a general condemnation. (*Ireland under the Tudors*, vol. i. p. 299.)

The actual instances of misconduct seem to me not numerous enough to sustain a general charge. The chief testimony for that purpose comes from Robert Cowley, Master of the Rolls in Ireland under Henry VIII. He wrote to Cromwell "that the Religious Houses in Ireland were less continent and virtuous than those in England." (*S. P.* ii. 371.) But if Cromwell and Henry found Cowley's report affirmed by others, or if they themselves believed its statements, it is difficult to understand why in no Irish Statute or Commission relating to the monks are charges of this kind made against them; especially as in one of the Commissions there are accusations of a different nature, viz. that the religious houses were addicted to "their own superstitious ceremonies," and to the "doctrines of the Roman Pontiff." (*Morrin*, vol. i. p. 55.) This observation is entitled to the more weight, because Henry, in his Act relating to the smaller monasteries in England, put forward their vicious living in justification of their suppression. (27 Henry VIII., c. 28.) It deserves to be noted that the Council, when petitioning for the preservation of six Religious Houses, say that "gentlemen's children and others were brought up in them in virtue." (*S. P.* vol. iii. p. 130.)



## NOTE Y. PAGE 96.

When Archbishop Browne in 1535 came to Ireland, the Reformation movement had considerably advanced in Germany, and had in England reached the stage indicated in Chapter I. *supra*; but there is no trace of its then having extended itself to Ireland, or, indeed, of its having there found any sympathisers whatever. In England it had been preceded by the agitation in the fourteenth century against abuses, doctrinal and practical, complained of in the Church, that had been led by Wycliffe, of which the effects continued through the fifteenth, and were not extinct in the sixteenth century. But in Ireland—whatever may have been the case in the early periods of its history (as to which see Ussher's *Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British*)—after the English Invasion and the Synod of Kells, 1172, the only indications of even individual discontent with the religious system of Rome, appear to me to have been in the instances of Archbishop Fitz Ralph, whose objections were, however, wholly directed against the monastic system, and of Crumpe, a monk at Baltinglass, who besides condemning the Friars, leaned to Protestant views as to the Eucharist (see Ussher, *Works*, vol. iv., pp. 285, 301–3). Both lived in the fourteenth century, and I cannot find any evidence that their opinions survived them in Ireland.

---

## NOTE Z. PAGE 97.

The first *printed* translation of the New Testament appeared after Queen Elizabeth's death. It was published in 1603 by Daniel, or O'Donnell (afterwards Archbishop of Tuam), with a dedication to James I. He, however, only completed and revised it; it had been begun in Elizabeth's lifetime by Nicholas Walsh and John Kearney, Chancellor and Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and had been continued under Daniel's predecessor, Donnellan. Daniel, in 1608, published an Irish version of the Prayer-book. After these versions of the New Testament and Prayer-book more than seventy years elapsed before an Irish translation of the Old Testament appeared. This was published in 1685. Its publication was in a great degree due to Robert Boyle, then well known for his philosophic studies: its preparation had been promoted by Bedell and Archbishop Marsh. (See as to the Irish Bible, Richardson's *Attempts to convert the native Irish*, pp. 15, 26).

## NOTE AA. PAGE 98.

It is not inconsistent with the low average standard of education which I have attributed to the native Irish laity at the era of the Reformation, that some of the chieftains may have deserved a different character. A rule is not disproved because there are exceptions, and individual instances of culture may co-exist with general barbarism.

The different condition of contemporary society in Germany and England was due to the invention about fifty years before, and the then extensive use, of printing. In Ireland until the reign of Edward VI., there was no printing press (see p. 46, *supra*); nor until a still later period was (so far as I can find) any book in the Irish language there or elsewhere printed. But without the aid of printing, books being multiplied slowly and with difficulty are necessarily so expensive as to place them beyond the reach of the mass of the community. Under such circumstances their study will be confined to the inmates of institutions which, like several of the monasteries, were formed for the purpose of promoting it, or the few outside these institutions in whom the monks as teachers might infuse similar tastes. It is remarkable that the Act of Uniformity passed by the Irish Parliament (A.D. 1560) distinctly asserted that "few in the whole realm could read the Irish letters." (See p. 68, *supra*.)

Whether during the subsequent years of Elizabeth's reign there was among the natives generally any educational improvement deserving notice, may be doubted. The constant wars and insurrections (see p. 81, *supra*) must have presented insuperable obstacles to progress. To adopt the language of Mr. Bagwell, in a very able review of the state of society in Ireland under Elizabeth,\* "fighting was the business of life." Accordingly, the contemporary accounts of the habits of the people seem to me much the same as those given of them in the reign of Henry VIII. (as to which see Note G).

## NOTE BB. PAGE 109.

The Irish Bishops at the date of the Convocation of 1613 were . . . Meiler Magrath (Cashel); Lyon (Cork); Crosby (Ardfert and Aghadoe); Linch (Clonfert); Hampton (Armagh); Montgomery (Meath); Echlin

---

\* *Ireland under the Tudors*, chap. liii., vol. iii., p. 441.

(Down); Moygne (Kilmore); Buckworth (Dromore); Knox (Raphoe); Tanner (Derry); Jones (Dublin); Pilsworth (Kildare); Wheeler (Ossory); Ram (Ferns); Adams (Limerick); Lancaster (Waterford); Ryder (Killaloe); Daniel (Tuam); and King (Elphin).

Of these the four first owed their nominations to Queen Elizabeth. The rest were appointed by James, the vacancies filled by him arising as follows:—At the death of Elizabeth there were seven bishoprics vacant, viz. Clogher, Kilmore, Ardagh, Dromore, Raphoe, Derry, Achonry. Afterwards other bishoprics became vacant by the deaths of their incumbents. The sixteen bishops above last-named represent those who, either by immediate, or in some instances after intervening, appointments, filled in 1613 the Sees in which vacancies had in these ways occurred; the appointments made by James in the interval between the Queen's death and 1613 being as follows:—To Raphoe, Derry, and Clogher, Montgomery, 1605: to Meath, the same, 1611: to Down, Todd, 1606; Dundas, 1612; Echlin, 1613: to Kilmore, Draper, 1604; Moygne, 1612: to Dromore, Todd, 1606; Tanner, 1613; Buckworth, 1613: to Raphoe, Knox, 1611: to Derry, Babington, 1610; Tanner, 1613: to Dublin, Jones, 1605: to Kildare, Pilsworth, 1604: to Ossory, Deane, 1610; Wheeler, 1613; Ram, 1613: to Limerick, Adams, 1603: to Waterford and Lismore, Lancaster, 1608: to Killaloe, Ryder, 1613: to Tuam, Daniel, 1609: to Elphin, King, 1611.

---

NOTE CC. PAGE 113.

The Irish Articles of 1615 are generally spoken of as if affirming merely the Calvinistic scheme of predestination, of which reprobation is an essential element. But the clause, to which I have called attention at p. 113, *supra*, seems to me designed to reduce the statements of the latter to the milder views which, as being supposed to represent the later opinions of St. Augustine, are by some writers termed Augustinianism. And in connection with this observation it deserves to be noted that among papers of Ussher, who drew the Articles, there is preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, a MS. tract by Hooker, which states what is there termed, “St. Augustine’s latter judgment” upon the question of predestination. This the Irish Articles seem to me to follow. Compare with them the following words of the tract: . . . “the whole body of mankind, in the view of God’s eternal knowledge, lay universally polluted with sin, worthy of condemnation and death: over the mass of corruption



there passed two acts of God—an act of favour, liberality, and grace, choosing part to be made partakers of everlasting glory; and an act of justice, forsaking the rest, and adjudging them to endless perdition; *these* vessels of wrath, *those* of mercy.” (See Appendix to vol. ii. of Keble’s edition of *Hooker’s Works*, p. 578.)

The Synod of Dort, where the question of predestination was made especially a subject of discussion, was held a few years after the Irish Articles had been enacted by Convocation. The theory put forward at that Synod by the Arminian party in opposition to Calvinism and Augustinianism was that there is election to salvation, but that the election is founded on foreknowledge of the conduct of the individuals elected. The Arminians failed at the Synod, but had afterwards the greater triumph of seeing from that time, at least among the clergy of the English Church, a gradual growth of their principles.

Previous to the Reformation there existed among theologians much the same differences of opinion, respecting the question of predestination, as there have been since. The Dominicans took one side, the Franciscans another. Thomas Aquinas, probably the highest authority among the schoolmen, was of the former Order. His views on the subject of predestination seem to resemble those attributed by Hooker to St. Augustine; at least I cannot find any solid distinction between the latter and the following extracts from Aquinas’s writings collected by Sir James Mackintosh in his *Dissertation upon the progress of Ethical Philosophy*. . . . *Predestinatio est causa gratiæ et gloriæ. Numerus predestinatorum certus est. Prescientia meritorum nullo modo est causa predestinationis divinæ. Liberum arbitrium est facultas qua bonum eligitur, gratia assistente, vel malum eadem desistente. Deus inclinatur ad bonum administrando virtutem agendi et monendo ad bonum. Sed ad malum dicitur inclinare in quantum gratiam non præbet, per quam aliquis a malo retraheretur.* (Edition of Aquinas’ Works cited, Paris, 1664, vol. vii., pp. 356, 363, 370; vol. viii., pp. 222, 364.)

The doctrine of the Church of England upon the question of predestination is expressed in Article XVII. of the XXXIX. Articles; and as this Article has been retained by the Church of Ireland, so also, it must be held, is its doctrine retained. The language of the Article has been so framed that persons of quite differing opinions do not refuse to subscribe it. An attempt was at one time—in the discussions before James I.—made by the Puritan Divines to limit its comprehensiveness, and to exclude from its scope Arminian views, but unsuccessfully. In practice the most liberal interpretation has always prevailed.

## NOTE DD. PAGE 134.

The first accounts of the loss of life in the Rebellion of 1641 were, there seems no doubt, much exaggerated, and especially as to the loss at the commencement. Sir William Petty (*Political Anatomy*, ch. iv.) thought that 37,000 were massacred in the first year of the tumults. Warner, one of the Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, after examining the depositions of witnesses in relation to the subject, which are still preserved in the library of that College, reduced the estimate of loss of life, directly and indirectly, during the first two years, to 12,000; but he seems to have rejected some evidence which he should have acted upon. A recent re-examination of these depositions has led to an estimate of the number "murdered by the sword, gun, rope, drowning, &c., in the first three or four years, not including those killed in battle, at 25,000." (See Miss Hickson's *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century*.) In this book for the first time some of the most important of the depositions are printed. The question of the number of lives lost in the first year of this rebellion is also discussed by Hallam (*Const. History*, ii. 352); by Froude (*English in Ireland*, ii. 96-113); and by Lecky (*Hist.*, ii. 125-170); but it is to be noted that their observations were written before Miss Hickson's work was published.

---

## NOTE EE. PAGE 156.

The bishoprics vacant at the Restoration are mentioned at page 139, *supra*; the surviving bishops at page 154, *supra*. Before the consecration in 1661 of two archbishops and ten bishops, narrated at page 156, *supra*, the following changes had taken place in the existing Episcopate. Bramhall had been translated from Derry to Armagh; Henry Leslie from Down and Connor to Meath.

The bishops consecrated on 27th January, 1661, were . . . Worth to Killaloe; Robert Leslie to Dromore; Baker to Waterford, &c.; Hall to Killala, &c.; Parker to Elphin; Synge to Limerick, &c.; Wild to Derry; Robert Pryce to Ferns; Jeremy Taylor to Down, &c.; Boyle to Cork, &c.; Pulein to Tuam, &c.; Margetson to Dublin.

On February 1, 1661, Fulwar was by patent translated from Ardfert to Cashel; on March 6, 1661, Thomas Price was appointed to Kildare,

one of the Sees vacant at the Restoration, which had been omitted in the appointments in January. Kilfenora, another of these, was given *in commendam* to Pullein, at this time consecrated to Tuam. Ardfer, vacated by Fulwar's translation to Cashel, was given *in commendam* to Synge, at this time consecrated to Limerick. Cloyne was to be held with Cork and Ross, and Ardagh with Kilmore. In June, 1661, John Leslie was translated from Raphoe to Clogher, vacated by the translation of Jones to Meath; and Raphoe was then filled by the appointment of Robert Leslie.

---

NOTE FF. PAGE 162.

The removal, after the Restoration, of the clergy with Presbyterian Orders, who had in Ulster during the Commonwealth obtained possession of the churches, glebes, and parishes, which until the death of Charles I. belonged to the then Established Church, seems to have been at the time acquiesced in, so far as the legal validity of the Act was the matter to be considered. The title of these clergymen was open to objection not merely because they had not episcopal orders, but because they could not show that they had been instituted by any authority which the law recognized, and were therefore intruders and trespassers.

It is to be kept in mind that there had never been any statute of an Irish Parliament under the Commonwealth to abrogate the old ecclesiastical law—indeed Parliament was not then at all summoned in Ireland. Such proceedings, therefore, as were taken during the period of its rule to the injury or against the laws of the Church, were looked upon as acts of usurpation, and incapable of conferring legal rights. The ecclesiastical law, which was in force under Charles I., was held to be the law rightfully, though not actually, operating in the interval between the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II.

The correctness of the objection founded upon the want of episcopal orders has been disputed, because in England in the reign of Elizabeth there were many ministers officiating in the parish churches who had not episcopal orders. (See Keble's *Hooker's Works*, vol. i. p. lxxvi.) But this may have been owing to the statute 13 Eliz., ch. 12 (confined to England)—which permitted such persons to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles before a prescribed time—being supposed to confirm their position. Most, too, of these persons had foreign orders, conferred in



countries where episcopacy did not exist; and to such orders there does not seem to have been equal objection as to non-episcopal orders at home. (See Bacon's *Advertisement*, written near the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, where he seems to treat the objection to foreign orders as a novelty.)

If the question of the validity of Presbyterian Orders as title to a benefice had been raised between 1560 and the Uniformity Act in a court of law in Ireland, the scale would probably have been turned against them by the Preface to the Ordinal, which, as part of the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI., had been adopted in the enactments of Elizabeth's Irish Uniformity Act, and had therefore so far parliamentary sanction. This preface expressly declared that no person should be accounted a bishop, priest, or deacon in the Church of Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except admitted according to the form then prescribed, or that he had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination.

The Irish Uniformity Act of Charles II. allowed, until 29th September, 1667, for persons incumbents or in possession of benefices without episcopal ordination, to obtain such orders; and if they had not then been obtained it *ipso facto* deprived these persons. For future ecclesiastical promotion any one not ordained according to the form of ordination in the Prayer-book was disqualified unless "he have formerly been made priest by episcopal ordination." \*

---

NOTE GG. PAGE 165.

The rubric or explanation at the end of the Communion Service in Charles II.'s Prayer-book (taken, with an alteration, from Edward VI.'s Second Prayer-book) was not in the latter as it was enacted by the English Parliament; it was introduced, before that Prayer-book was published, by an order of the King and Council, October 27, 1552. This Rubric has been called "the Black Rubric."

The *accipe spiritum sanctum*, which in the Ordinal of the same Prayer-book is qualified by reference to the office of the person ordained or conse-

---

\* The word "formerly" in this clause seems to me not (as some have supposed) confined to the date of the Act. And in this construction is probably to be found the reason why a Roman Catholic priest, conforming to the Church of England, may hold a benefice in it without re-ordination. Of this practice the great preacher Kirwan is probably in Ireland the most celebrated example. (See as to Roman Catholic Orders, Phillimore's note to Burns' *Ecc. Law*, ed. 1842, vol. iii. p. 70.)

crated, was in the forms in use immediately before the Reformation, in, however, a different part of the Services, and subsequent to the ordaining or consecrating words. In the very earliest forms of consecration and ordination these words do not at all occur. They are found in the Service for Consecration of Bishops before they were in that for ordaining Priests, but it is not clear when first. Their introduction in the latter service is attributed by some to the twelfth century, by others placed later; and this a Pontifical among Archbishop Ussher's MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin (B. 36, fol. i, c. xxx a, referred to in Bishop Reeves's *Colton's Visitation*, p. 99), rather tends to confirm. For it is itself supposed to be (Bishop Reeves informs me) of the twelfth century, yet has not the words in its Ordinal, their introduction being directed on the margin in handwriting of a much later period.

The Services for the King's Accession, for 5th November (Gunpowder Plot), 29th May (birth and return of Charles II.), and 30th January (death of Charles I.), in the Prayer-book of Charles II., were not in the copy enacted by Parliament; they were inserted under the authority of the Crown, having been sanctioned by Convocation. The service for 5th November was altered under William III., so as to refer to his own landing on that day. Finally it was, along with those of 29th May and 30th January, removed from the Prayer-book by a royal warrant dated January 17th, 1859, parliamentary authority not being thought necessary for removing what had been inserted without this sanction.

It may be well here to mention that Overall in his addition to the Catechism (see p. 146, n., *supra*) followed a previous short catechism framed by Nowell. (See Groves' *Tract*, 1872.)

---

NOTE HH. PAGE 176.

As early as the reigns of Henry V. and VI. the English Parliament had asserted the right to make laws to bind Ireland. In opposition to the claim the Irish Parliament in the latter reign resolved that it alone possessed this right. In considering the influence which the English Government exercised over the legislation of the Irish Parliament, it has not been sufficiently observed that this claim of the English Parliament, whether thought to be well or ill-founded, predisposed the Irish Parliament to enact the measures of the English Government; since if well-founded, opposition was useless, as there remained the ultimate resource

of the English Parliament; and if ill-founded, yet being advanced by the stronger power, who might proceed to maintain it by force, prudence would suggest to obviate controversy by voting for what was desired.

---

NOTE II. PAGE 254.

That the native Irish have, with exceptions, inconsiderable when compared with their numbers, refused to conform to Protestantism, appears from the census: for Episcopalian Protestants are numerous only in localities where there has been English colonization, and Presbyterian Protestants numerous only where there has been Scotch colonization.\*

In the nineteenth century, when for the first time any extensive missionary exertions were made for the conversion of Irish Roman Catholics, at first the agitation for Catholic Emancipation, afterwards the Tithe War (p. 240, 243, *supra*) did, until 1838, by themselves raise barriers against the success of such exertions, extremely difficult to surmount. But they cannot be considered by themselves, since the present is the result of the past, and to understand what is, we must keep in mind what has been.

Recurring, therefore, to the events appearing in the course of the narrative contained in this treatise, we find that at first the mode in which Protestantism originated in Ireland was unfavourable to its establishment in the Irish districts, and that subsequently its progress among the natives was hindered by circumstances the most adverse. The Reformation did not there grow spontaneously; it came from the English Government, before the authority of that Government had been completely acknowledged by the descendants of the original inhabitants, or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say, while the relations between the two parties were still those of

---

\* Roman Catholics, Protestants belonging to the Church, and Presbyterians, according to the census of 1861, were distributed in the provinces as follows:—

	Rom. Caths.	Chur. Prots.	Presbyterians.
Ulster, . . .	966,613	391,315	503,835
Leinster, . . .	1,252,553	180,587	12,355
Munster, . . .	1,420,076	80,860	4,013
Connaught, . . .	866,023	40,595	3,088
Total, . . .	4,505,265	693,357	523,291



absolute hostility. When it had been introduced, none of the measures calculated to reconcile the population dwelling outside the Pale to a new religious system were adopted. Obedience to the ecclesiastical enactments of a Parliament, in which at first there was no representation, and afterwards an insignificant representation, of the natives, was commanded, without any effort, at least until after the death of Queen Elizabeth, to instruct or persuade. In the interval between that event and the thirteenth century—a period of nearly two hundred years—some exertions for these purposes were made; but, in themselves feeble, and spread over long tracts of time, they were wholly inadequate to obtain even a hearing from a people among whom the confiscations in Ulster by James I., in the three other provinces by the Commonwealth, wherever there was property belonging to an adherent of James II. by William, and after these the systematized oppression of the Penal Laws, successively kept alive a spirit of discontent and resentment predisposed to reject whatever was taught or recommended from England.

In connection, however, with these observations it is proper to notice an opinion entertained by some that, quite independent of the circumstances of their position and history, there are difficulties, less capable of being removed, which hinder the progress of Protestantism among the native Irish. They are of Celtic race; and the character of that race, it is said, inclines them to favour ritualistic and ceremonial systems of religion.\*

But general principles of this nature, if applied to explain results, and still more if applied to guide action, are to be used with caution. While the tendencies thus attributed to the Celts are to be expected in a race fervid, emotional, easily affected through the imagination and feelings, tendencies may exist without prevailing, and race is not an altogether overpowering influence in the social system; it is only one of several agencies which operate at the same time, and the effect is the representative of the reciprocal action of all, not of the exclusive action

---

\* Motley is one of those who attribute to Celtic people these sympathies. He assigns as one of the causes why Protestantism extended itself in some and not in other provinces of the Netherlands, "that in the latter there was a greater infusion of the Celtic element always keenly alive to sensuous and splendid manifestations of the devotional principle."—(*History of the Dutch Republic*, vol. iii., p. 82). With him may be compared the character given to the ancient Celts by the historian, through whom they are best known, *Natio est omnis Gallorum* (and Galli, Galatæ, and Celtæ are but varieties of the same race), *admodum dedita religionibus* (Caesar, B. G. vi. 16).

of any one. If, as a general rule, it be true that Protestantism has not been successful in attracting to its side Celtic nations, it is equally true that to this rule there are remarkable exceptions. The inhabitants of Wales, Cornwall, the Isle of Man, and the Highlands of Scotland are of Celtic origin: yet in the three first instances they are wholly, and in the last by a majority, Protestant.

---

## NOTE KK. PAGE 259.

In the Report of 1868, the annual revenues of the Established Church of Ireland (exclusive of the value of houses of residence and lands in the occupation of ecclesiastical persons), after deducting an allowance for the proportion of poor-rates, which the persons paying rents and tithe rentcharge were entitled to deduct from ecclesiastical owners, and after deducting the expenses of collection and quit-rents were estimated to be: . . . From the rents of lands let to tenants, £204,932 19s. 7d.; from tithe rentcharge, £364,224 16s. 11d.; from other sources, £15,530 6s. 1d.; making in all, £584,688 2s. 7d. In this estimate the amount actually deducted on account of poor-rate for the year 1866 was taken as a measure of the allowance made on that account. In the same Report the value set on the houses of residence and the lands connected with them, which were actually in the occupation of ecclesiastical persons, was derived from the official valuation for the purposes of local taxation. It amounted to £50,237 yearly. This, of course, was subject to the taxes which affect occupiers of land, such as poor-rate, &c., which in the year 1866 came to £18,086. The building charges due in respect of the houses were returned at £232,335. The net revenues seem to have been distributed among their ecclesiastical owners in the following manner: the bishops owned about £58,000 a-year; the capitular bodies about £19,000 a-year; the Ecclesiastical Commissioners about £113,000 a-year; and the beneficed incumbents the remainder. Of the benefices with incumbents, the emoluments—after deducting for poor-rate, &c., and making an allowance for actual payments to curates in 1866, and for the rent of a house when there was no glebe-house—seem to have been much as follows: . . . Of about 300 under £100 a-year; of about 420 between £100 and £200 a-year; of about 355

between £200 and £300 a-year; those of the remainder were more than that amount, but in only seven instances did they equal or exceed £1000 a-year. (See Tables annexed to the Report: viii. as amended in Appendix, p. 249, ix., x., xx., xxi., xxii., xxvi., xxviii.)

---

NOTE LL. PAGE 263.

The property which, under the Irish Church Act, became vested in the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland, was by them applied in the first place to meet the charges imposed upon it by the Act, including the very large sum paid to the Representative Body to enable commutation of the incomes of the bishops and clergy of the Church to be carried out (see p. 303, *supra*). As the conversion of this property into money could not be expected to be immediate, advances upon its security amounting, between 1870 and 1875, to £9,000,000 were obtained from the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; and then the monies received from time to time from the property were applied by the Temporalities' Commissioners towards repayment of these advances. The Act enabled the redemption of tithe rentcharge to be effected by terminable annuities, and in some instances purchase-monies to be paid in like manner. The result of this was that the Temporalities' Commissioners have become possessed of a large amount of terminable annuities. Even, however, with these advantages it was not practicable to dispose of a very large portion of the tithe rentcharges and head rents at the prices required. As twenty years of disestablishment have now elapsed without their conversion, these may be looked upon as permanent income. At the present time what remains of the Church property is vested in the Irish Land Commissioners, to whom it was transferred from the Church Temporalities' Commissioners. Its position is shown in a Paper presented by the Treasury Department to the House of Commons, 16th April, 1890 (Parl. Paper of that year, 130). The property consists of (1) terminable annuities (such as have been referred to), and (2) of the income from unconverted property which may be regarded as permanent. The two together produce about £550,000 a-year. The terminable annuities will cease in 1932; the permanent (about £266,000 a-year) will still continue. There yet remains due to the Commissioners for Reduction of the National Debt on foot of the advance for Church purposes,



£3,265,715. The surplus of Church property referred to in the clause of the Church Act stated at page 263, *supra*, is, therefore, the value of £550,000 a-year, decreasing in 1932 to £266,000 a-year, above £3,265,715 charged upon it. In a report of the Temporalities' Commissioners (1880) this surplus was estimated at £6,500,000.

The following charges, imposed by Parliament, affected this surplus on the 16th April, 1890 :—

1st charge under Intermediate Education Act, 1878, . . .	£1,000,000
2nd „ „ National School Teachers Act, 1879, . . .	1,300,000
3rd „ „ Royal University Act, 1881; estimated value of annuity of £20,000 per annum, . . .	600,000
4th „ „ Relief of Distress under Acts, 1880, . . .	1,271,500
5th „ „ Arrears of Rent Act, 1882, . . .	950,000
6th „ „ Relief of Distressed Unions under Act, 1883, . . .	19,181
7th „ „ Sea Fisheries Act, 1883, . . .	95,000
8th „ „ Poor Relief Act, 1886, . . .	14,000

As some of the advances under numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 are by way of loan, the exact ultimate burden thus imposed does not at present appear.

---

NOTE MM. PAGE 283.

Episcopacy continuing after the Reformation to be a cardinal and essential part of the systems of the Established Churches of England and Ireland, while it was at the same time rejected in the constitution of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and Ireland, and was objected to by several Protestant dissenting sects in England and Ireland, has necessarily been a subject of controversy much debated. In the discussion of questions raised in connexion with it, the Divines of the two established Churches did not, as we have had occasion to see,\* put forward one uniform view respecting the origin of the episcopal office. The theories, however, which they have advocated seem all reducible to the three propositions which will be now stated :—

I. No one precise form of Church government is absolutely prescribed in the Scriptures. A regular ministry was constituted; but no specific order of pre-eminence or distribution of office and authority was laid

---

\* See notes, p. 120 and p. 283, *supra*.

down. The Nation, which from one aspect is seen as the State and from another as the Church, is entitled to make its own selection among systems of Church government, and to adopt for itself that which it shall consider the best adapted to its peculiar needs and exigencies.

II. The order of bishops is of apostolical institution; and, in the constitution of a national Church, it ought, on that ground, to be an element.

III. The order of bishops is of divine institution—a mode of government not resting upon mere practice or usage, but enjoined as of universal and perpetual obligation in the Christian religious system.

The Divines whose opinions are represented in the first proposition (I.) point out the advantages which accrue from ecclesiastical government being, like the civil government, not bound by one inflexible model. In each the end—the order and well-being of the community—remains always the same, but the means by which it is to be attained can be varied so as to adapt them to the vicissitudes of time and occasion, and bring them into harmony with the condition, circumstances, and dispositions of the people among whom they are to be introduced.

Those who support the second proposition (II.) in general consider that what is *apostolici juris* is *divini juris* also, since we may assume the Apostles to have been guided by a divine impulse, or at least controlled by a divine superintendence. They do not, however, in general, hold Episcopacy to be *divini juris* in the same sense as ordinances (*e.g.* the sacraments), which were established by our Lord; and the institution is, therefore (they concede), not, as such ordinances are, either indispensably necessary or immutable. An apostolical succession from the foundation of the order they concede, but for the most part explain it in the sense that the order has been uninterruptedly continued, not that any particular bishop has a succession in himself.

The advocates of the third proposition (III.) regard bishops as direct successors of the Apostles. Most of them interpret the commission implied in the words of our Lord after His Resurrection—"As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you"—to be one conferred not generally, but upon the Apostles, and regard the accompanying act—"He breathed on them"—as done in analogy with the original gift of "the breath of life"; the breath in each case not being restricted to the immediate recipients of the benefit, but designed to be transmitted through them in a perpetual series of successors.

## NOTE NN. PAGE 287.

The occasions upon which the Irish bishops unsuccessfully pressed the claims of the Irish Church to have its Convocation, like the English Convocations, summoned along with Parliament and allowed to proceed to business, were—(1) when discussions arose in these English assemblies respecting a new proposed Canon to permit parents to be sponsors for their children, and a proposed special form of Thanksgiving for Harvest; (2) and when the disestablishment of the Church seemed imminent.

On the first occasion it was urged that if the proposed changes were carried out in England, and the Prayer-book altered without the sanction of the Irish Convocation, the anomaly would be presented in an United Church of its formularies being varied upon the action of two out of four Provinces (York and Canterbury), while the other two (Armagh and Dublin) were not even consulted upon the matter.

On the second occasion when it was seen that the Irish Convocation was not to be summoned or licensed to meet by the Crown, it was suggested that, as the Act of Submission had never been passed by an Irish Parliament (compare page 14 with page 24, *supra*), the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin could of their own authority, without any licence from the Crown, summon Convocation or Provincial Synods. This suggestion led to the Government submitting to the Irish Law Officers and to the author of the present treatise in consultation, the question of the legality of such a course. The opinion given was unfavourable, for, although the Submission Act had not been extended to Ireland, yet as it professed to declare the Common Law, and the Common Law of Ireland was the same as the Common Law of England, it in effect declared the law operative in Ireland upon the subject. Without the Supremacy Act it must be held to be an incident of the Supremacy that (as Blackstone lays down) “the King convenes, prorogues, restrains, regulates, and dissolves all ecclesiastical synods or convocations.”



## NOTE OO. PAGE 305.

The Representative Body yearly submits to the General Synod a report of the financial condition of the Church. The last Report (1890) brings the accounts down to 31st December, 1889. The amount of subscriptions, legacies, and donations, which were received in the year 1889 was £170,724. The Representative Body had then £3,550,320 remaining of the commutation money paid over to it by the Commissioners of Church Temporalities as the capitalized value of the annuities of the ecclesiastical persons who commuted their incomes under the provisions of the Irish Church Act (see page 302, *supra*). The original amount of annuities charged on the commutation money had by deaths, composition, &c., been then reduced to £94,342 a-year, payable to 431 persons, which continued to be charged on and payable out of the remaining capital sum. Beside this capital sum, and the glebes purchased, the Representative Body then had in investments about £3,057,785; of which the sum of £500,000 had been paid to them as a substitute for private endowments under the Act of Parliament, and the rest was derived from bequests, donations, &c.

For the endowment of the bishoprics capital sums have been set apart; in the case of the revived bishopric of Clogher, the larger part of the endowment was derived from donations of the Rev. John Grey Porter, since deceased, and of his son, Mr. John Porter, of Belleisle, County Fermanagh.

According to Charles' *Directory of the Irish Church* for 1890, the number of incumbents was 1179, and of curates, 342; making in all 1521 clergymen serving in the parishes.

In 1881 a Census was taken, which ascertained the religious profession of the people of Ireland, and the number of persons who classed themselves as of each Church or persuasion. The following Table contains the returns of this Census, and also of the Census of 1861, which was the last before disestablishment:—

A.D.	Roman Catholics.	Prot. Episcopalians.	Presbyterians.	Methodists.	All other Persuasions except Jews.	Jews.	Total.
1861	4,505,265	693,357	523,291	45,399	31,262	393	5,798,967
1881	3,960,891	639,574	470,734	48,839	53,796	472	5,174,306

## NOTE PP. PAGE 306.

The Bishops in 1850, when Cotton's Lists of Bishops of each diocese consecutively end (*Fasti*, vol. iv.), were:—

See.	Bishop.	Suc- ceeded.	Vacated.
Armagh, . . . . .	Lord John G. Beresford, . .	1822	1862
Dublin and Kildare, . . . .	Richard Whately, . . . .	1831	1863
Clogher, . . . . .	Lord Robt. Tottenham, . .	1822	1850
Meath, . . . . .	Thomas S. Townsend, . . .	1850	1852
Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	John Leslie, . . . . .	1841	1854
Down and Connor, . . . . .	Robert Knox, . . . . .	1849	1886
Derry and Raphoe from 1834,	Hon. Richard Ponsonby, . .	1831	1853
Ossory, &c., . . . . .	James T. O'Brien, . . . .	1842	1874
Cashel, &c., . . . . .	Robert Daly, . . . . .	1843	1872
Cork, &c., . . . . .	James Wilson, . . . . .	1848	1857
Limerick, &c., . . . . .	William Higgin, . . . . .	1849	1863
Killaloe and Kilfenora, . .	Hon. Ludlow Tonson, . . .	1839	1861
Tuam, &c., . . . . .	Hon. Thomas Plunket, . .	1839	1867

## APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN 1850 AND DISESTABLISHMENT.

Meath, . . . . .	Joseph H. Singer, . . . .	1852	1866
Derry and Raphoe, . . . .	William Higgin, . . . . .	1853	1867
Limerick, &c., . . . . .	Henry Griffin, . . . . .	1854	1866
Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	Marcus Gervais Beresford, .	1854	1862
Cork, &c., . . . . .	William Fitzgerald, . . .	1857	1862
Killaloe, &c., . . . . .	William Fitzgerald, . . .	1862	1884
Cork, &c., . . . . .	John Gregg, . . . . .	1862	1878
Armagh and Clogher, . . . .	Marcus Gervais Beresford, .	1862	1886
Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	Hamilton Verschoyle, . . .	1862	1870
Dublin and Kildare, . . . .	Richard Chenevix Trench, .	1864	1885
Limerick, &c., . . . . .	Charles Graves, . . . . .	1866	—
Meath, . . . . .	Samuel Butcher, . . . . .	1866	1876
Tuam, &c., . . . . .	Hon. Charles B. Bernard, .	1867	1890
Derry and Raphoe, . . . .	William Alexander, . . . .	1867	—

## APPOINTMENTS SUBSEQUENT TO DISESTABLISHMENT.\*

Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	Charles Leslie, . . . . .	1870	1870
Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	Thomas Carson, . . . . .	1870	1874
Cashel, &c., . . . . .	Maurice F. Day, . . . . .	1872	—
Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	John R. Darley, . . . . .	1874	1884
Ossory, &c., . . . . .	Robert S. Gregg, . . . . .	1875	1878
Meath, &c., . . . . .	Lord Plunket, . . . . .	1876	1885
Ossory, &c., . . . . .	William Pakenham Walsh, .	1878	—
Cork, &c., . . . . .	Robert S. Gregg, . . . . .	1878	—
Killaloe, &c., . . . . .	William Bennet Chester, .	1884	—
Kilmore, &c., . . . . .	Samuel Shone, . . . . .	1884	—
Dublin and Kildare, . . . .	Lord Plunket, . . . . .	1885	—
Meath, . . . . .	Charles Parsons Reichel, .	1885	—
Armagh, . . . . .	Robert Knox, . . . . .	1886	—
Down, &c., . . . . .	William Reeves, . . . . .	1886	—
Clogher, . . . . .	Charles M. Stack, . . . . .	1886	—
Tuam, &c., . . . . .	James O'Sullivan, . . . . .	1890	—

\* The fourth volume of Cotton's *Fasti* contains, in a tabular form, the succession of

## NOTE QQ. PAGE 310.

In the instances of the Communion Service and of the Form of Ordination of Priests, as they were in the Prayer-book of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Preface to the Revised Prayer-book of the Church of Ireland refers to the objections made to them in the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, in such manner as indicates the nature of these objections; but in the case of "the Formularies relating to Baptism, it merely describes the objections as connected with certain expressions touching which diversities of opinion have prevailed among faithful members of the Church."

I. In the case of the first, viz. the Communion Service, the objection referred to in the Preface is that there were in the Prayer-book "certain expressions which might seem to lend some pretext for the teaching of doctrine concerning the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, repugnant to that set forth in the Articles of Religion, wherein it is expressly declared that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the mean whereby it is therein received and eaten is faith." This objection the Preface treats as not well founded, because, "upon a full and impartial review," there was not found "in the formularies any just warrant for such teaching."\*

II. In the case of the second, viz. the Form of Ordination of Priests, the objection pointed at in the Preface appears to be that words used in that Service ascribe to the Ministers of the Church a greater power in respect to forgiveness of sins than is warranted by Scripture. The words suggested to have this effect are not stated in the Preface; but they were, "receive

---

Bishops for each diocese. Reference should also be made to a fifth volume, published at a later date, for which assistance was obtained from J. R. Garstin, F.S.A., to whom the present treatise also is indebted for aid in connexion with the Notes of the Appendix, which relate to the succession in the Irish Episcopate subsequently to the Reformation.

With reference to the appointments of Bishops since Disestablishment, it is to be noted, that the two first, viz. of Leslie and Carson to Kilmore, were made not by the Diocesan Synods, as the others have been, but by the Crown, to which, by the Church Act, the power was reserved of appointing Bishops in the interval between the passing of the Act, and its coming into operation, on January 1st, 1871.

\* With this may be compared the dictum in the judgment of the Privy Council in the case of *Shepherd v. Bennett*, where the question as to the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament was discussed—that "any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver, the Church of England does not by her Articles and Formularies affirm."



ye the Holy Ghost," &c., and "whose sins thou dost forgive," &c. (respecting which see Note GG of Appendix). This objection is treated in the Preface as not well founded, as based, like the objection in relation to the Communion, upon an erroneous interpretation of the formularies of the Church, which, it is declared, ascribe "no power or authority to the Church, or any of its Ministers, in respect of the forgiveness of sins after baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing on God's part remission of sins;" and do not anywhere teach or imply "that confession to, or absolution by a Priest, are any conditions of God's pardon;" but, on the contrary, do teach that "all Christians who sincerely repent and unfeignedly believe the Gospel, may draw nigh, as worthy communicants to the Lord's Table, without any such confession or absolution."

III. In the case of the Formularies relating to Baptism, the objections made in the Synod were to the application of the word "regenerate" to the baptised child, *e.g.* "seeing that this child is by baptism regenerate and grafted into Christ's Church." The Preface admits that diversities of opinion have prevailed respecting these expressions among members of the Church, and that great consequent liberty of exposition had existed. This liberty it recognises, and so confirms. As illustrative of the previous liberty the judgment of the Privy Council in England in the case of *Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter* may be referred to.

It is to be noted that the objections urged in the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the word "regenerate" had been made by the Non-conformists at the revision of the Prayer-book in England under Charles II. They were then, in discussions between their Divines and the Bishops (known, from the place where these were held, as the Savoy Conference), answered by the latter saying: . . . "Seeing that God's Sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not, *ponere obicem*, put any bar against them (which children cannot do), we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit." (*Cardwell's Conferences*, 356.)

---

NOTE RR. PAGE 310.

The Prayer-book published by the General Synod differs from that which was formerly used in the United Church of England and Ireland, and is still used in the Church of England, in the following particulars:—

I. In the Prefaces, a new Preface is inserted (see page 307, *supra*),

and the dates are put to the former Prefaces. The entire of the addendum to the Preface which is entitled, "concerning the Services of the Church," and which is in fact a Rubric, has been omitted. This takes away the direction that "all Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause."

II. The direction how the Psalter is to be read is placed at the head of the Psalter; the order how Holy Scripture is appointed to be read is, in some respects, altered: and the Lectionary which follows varies from the English, principally by omitting all Lessons taken from the Apocrypha, and by inserting additional Lessons from the Apocalypse (see page 310, *supra*).

III. After the Table of Vigils, &c., there is inserted power for the Archbishops and Bishops to appoint Days of Humiliation, and Days of Thanksgiving, to be observed by the Church of Ireland, and to prescribe special services for the same. Here also there is introduced a Note on the Golden Numbers.

IV. In the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, in the title the words "to be said and used," before "daily," are omitted; also the direction as to dress is omitted; and this is hereafter to be regulated by the Canons (see page 310, *supra*). Then are introduced powers, to enable selections from the Services, with approval of the Ordinary, to be used; and also for the use of the Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, and the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, as separate Services, or in any combination, subject to the control of the Ordinary. And if the use of full Services be found seriously inconvenient, the Ordinary may dispense with one or more of them. With his permission a sermon may, on special occasions, be preached without the use of morning or evening prayer, some prayers from them being used. The Archbishops may vary the prayers relating to the Royal family. It is explained that though all things set forth are to be read or sung in the English tongue, this is not to prevent the Irish language, or any other the people may understand better, being substituted.

V. In the Order for Morning Prayer, the cxlviii. Psalm (*Laudate Dominum*) is introduced as an alternative to the *Te Deum* or *Benedicite*. When the Litany is said, the Lord's Prayer and three versicles after the Creed may be omitted.

VI. The Rubric directing the use of the Athanasian Creed is

omitted; and the Creed remains without alteration, but with no direction as to its use (see page 310, *supra*).

VII. There is a new Rubric before the Litany directing what is to be read with it, when it is read either as a separate Service or in combination with the Communion Service.

VIII. In the occasional prayers and thanksgivings there is introduced from the Service for the 20th June a prayer for Unity; also the following new prayers—(1) for a sick person; (2) on the Rogation days; (3) on New Year's Day; (4) for Christian Missions; (5) for the General Synod while it is in Session; (6) for use in Colleges and Schools; (7) a thanksgiving for recovery from sickness. The prayer for use in time of plague, &c., is altered in some respects; so also is the prayer for Parliament, in which for the words "most religious and gracious Queen," are substituted the words, "our Sovereign Lady the Queen."

IX. In connexion with the Collects, Epistles, &c., there are three Rubrics providing, among other things, for the case of a holyday falling upon a Sunday. If on Christmas Day or Easter Day there are two celebrations of the Holy Communion, a new Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are provided, which may be used at the first. For the Sunday after Easter Day there is a new Epistle.

X. In connexion with the Order for Administration of the Lord's Supper the preliminary Rubric is altered in some respects; so also are the Rubrics before the Offertory. In the Offertory sentences the two which were taken from Tobit are omitted. The Rubric about the collection of the Offertory is altered, in order to enable it to be before the sermon. In the Nicene Creed, in the words "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life," a comma has been inserted after Lord, to bring the sense more to the Greek form, viz., τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν. The Rubric before the exhortation to those who come to the Communion contains an insertion of the words "those who do not intend to communicate, having had opportunity to withdraw." The exhortation is slightly altered. It may be omitted at the discretion of the minister (the consent of the Ordinary having been first obtained), but provided that it shall be read once a month at least, and at all great festivals. In the Rubric before the prayer of consecration the words "standing at the North side of the table" have been introduced (see the canons on this head, page 310, *supra*). At the end of the office some additional Collects are introduced; one of which may



be used after the Offertory when "the prayer for the Church Militant" is not read. In the Rubrics which follow these Collects provisions are added which enable the minister to dispense with the "prayer for the Church Militant," prohibit the administration of the Communion unless two at the least are present, and permit on occasions sanctioned by the Ordinary the service to begin with the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. The direction as to the nature of the bread is now imperative—"shall be," not as before, "it shall suffice that it be." When by reason of numbers it is inconvenient to address each communicant separately, the words, on delivering the elements, may, with the consent of the Ordinary, be said once to as many as shall together kneel at the Holy Table; but they are to be said separately to any communicant desiring it.

XI. In the Service for Public Baptism of Infants alterations are made in the Rubrics, the effect of which is to permit parents to be sponsors for their own children; and when three sponsors cannot be found, to allow two; and if two cannot be found, to allow one. Also some alterations are made as to the times for administration of the rite. In the exhortation at the beginning of the service, in place of the words "except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost," are substituted the words "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit." Also the Rubric before the words "I baptize thee" has been altered, and now reads, "he shall dip it (the child) in the water discreetly and warily, if they shall desire it, and he shall be certified that the child may well endure it; otherwise it shall suffice to pour water upon it." At the end of the service a new Rubric is added, which explains the use of the sign of the cross: "that it is not thereby intended to add any new rite to this sacrament as a part of it, or necessary to it; or that the using of that sign is of any virtue or efficacy of itself, but only to remind all Christians of the death and cross of Christ, which is their hope and their glory; and to put them in mind of their obligation to bear the cross in such manner as God shall think fit to lay it upon them, and to become conformable to Christ in his sufferings." In the Public Baptism of Adults the opening exhortation is modified, as in the Service for Infants, and a new Rubric states that persons of riper years may, upon great and urgent cause, be baptized in private.

XII. In the Catechism a question and answer having relation to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper have been introduced (see page 308, *supra*). In the Rubric directing the curate to catechise, for the words

“on Sundays and Holydays” are substituted “at such times as he shall think convenient.” The direction in another Rubric that everyone shall have a godfather or godmother as a witness of their confirmation has been omitted.

XIII. In the Order for Confirmation is inserted a question asking those baptized in riper years if they renew the promise of their baptism. The Rubric as to admission to the Holy Communion is now changed into “every person ought to present himself for Confirmation (unless prevented by some urgent reason) before he partakes of the Lord’s Supper.”

XIV. In the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony the first Rubric recognises the use of Licences, and gives directions as to Banns. In the opening exhortation there are some verbal changes. Directions are given for procedure when more than one couple are married. The prayer beginning “O merciful Lord!” is verbally altered. At the end of the Service there are added the third of the Collects after the Offertory, and the benedictory prayer for grace (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

XV. In the Visitation of the Sick there is a new Rubric, permitting the minister to edify and comfort the sick as he shall think meet by instruction or prayer; but if the sick person requires the office to be used, the minister shall use it. A precatory form of absolution is substituted for the former (see page 309, *supra*); and in the Rubric before it the words “the sick person shall be moved to make confession” are changed into “if the sick person feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter,” and the words “he shall absolve him” into the words “the minister shall say thus.” There are added a new alternative Collect after the absolution, and a new prayer for a sick person when his sickness is assuaged. In the Communion of the Sick the Rubric before it is modified, to allow the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel of the day to be used in place of those prescribed. Power is given to shorten the office if the person is sick; and the last Rubric is in some respects varied.

XVI. In the Order for Burial of the Dead the first Rubric is enlarged, and allows in certain cases a portion of the office to be used for unbaptized persons: an alternative Lesson from 1 Thess. is added to the former one from 1 Cor. xv. In the words said at the grave, beginning “For as much,” &c., the words “of His great mercy” are left out. In the prayer beginning “Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart this life,” for the words “we give Thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver,” &c., are substituted the words

“we bless Thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear.”

XVII. In the Communion Service the first exhortation has been modified; and in the long exhortation “fruits of penance” have been changed to “fruits of repentance.”

XVIII. Rubrics are placed before the Psalter taken out of the old prefaces.

XIX. In the Ordination and Consecration Services Church is used instead of Realm, and also of Church and Realm.

XX. In the Form for the Anniversary of Her Majesty’s accession, there are some unimportant variations of Rubrics, and some Collects are omitted.

XXI. Some emendations are made in the former Irish Service for Visitation of Prisoners; in the Absolution in this Service the same change is made as in the Visitation of the Sick.

XXII. There are the following new Services:—(1) “To be used on the first Sunday on which a minister officiates in a church to which he has been instituted;” (2) “A form of thanksgiving for the blessing of harvest;” (3) “A form for the consecration of a church;” (4) “A form of consecration of a churchyard or other burial-ground.”

---



# INDEX.

---

ABBADIE, Dean of Killaloe, 203; his treatise in defence of Christianity, 203; it received the praise of Pitt, 203, *note*.

Anne, Queen from 1702 to 1714, 178; under her the Penal Code completed, 178; she grants the First Fruits for the benefit of the Church, and remits the Twentieths, 181; resumes the practice of summoning Convocation in Ireland, 183; bishops appointed by her, 188; effect of the Civil policy of her reign in Ireland, 190.

Appropriations, injurious effects of, in the English Church, 4; in the Irish Church, 89; the policy of confiscation in respect of them adopted by Henry VIII., 91; and continued by Edward VI. and Elizabeth, 92; when confiscated they were not restored to the Church, 93; but retained for the Crown, or granted to laymen, 92; injurious consequences to the Church as late as Anne's reign remarked by Swift, 182.

Aquinas, Thomas, his views upon the question of Predestination, Appendix CC.

Armagh, Archbishopric of, from a remote date the Primacy among the dioceses of the Irish Church was conceded to, Appendix T.

Articles, XXXIX., were adopted in England under Elizabeth, 77; these not then introduced into the

Irish Church, 77; the first Articles brought into use in Ireland were eleven in number, 77; their nature, 78; in 1713 other Articles, 104 in number, were framed by the Irish Convocation, 111; in what respects these differ from the English XXXIX., 112, and Appendix CC; in 1634 the XXXIX. Articles were adopted by the Irish Convocation, 129; they have been retained by the Irish Church after disestablishment, 296.

Assembly of Westminster Divines, 136; Solemn League and Covenant approved by them, 136; their Directory for public worship, confession, and catechisms, 136, 137; rejected by Lord Ormonde's army in Ireland, 137; accepted by General Munroe's army in Ireland, 137.

BEDELL, appointed Bishop of Kilmore by James I., 148; short account of him, 148.

Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, his character and history, 200; his philosophical writings, 201; his theory of vision, 201; division of opinion respecting it, 201, *note*; his patriotism, 202; controversy with Bishop Peter Browne, 204.

Beresford, Marcus Gervais, Archbishop of Armagh, 259; his observations on the condition of the Irish Church in 1868, 259, *note*;

- presides in the Upper House of Convocation in September, 1869, 290; judicious advice to the clergy in reference to the legislation of the Church consequent upon disestablishment, 294.
- Bible translated into Irish, the New Testament in 1603, the Old in 1685, 186, Appendix Z.
- Bishops of the Irish Reformed Church, *see* Episcopate.
- Boulter, Archbishop of Armagh, 219; guides both the civil and ecclesiastical policy of the English Government in Ireland, 219; urges that the high civil and ecclesiastical offices should be filled by Englishmen, 220.
- Bourke, Archbishop of Tuam, 221; praised by Grattan, 221, *note*.
- Boyle, Michael, Bishop of Cork, &c., 174; translated to Armagh, 174; also Lord Chancellor, 174; the last ecclesiastic who was Chancellor in Ireland, 174.
- Bramhall, accompanies Strafford to Ireland, 126; measures of both in relation to the Irish Church, 126; they obtain from the Irish Convocation the adoption of the XXXIX. Articles, 129; Bramhall then bishop of Derry, 129; at the Restoration he was translated to Armagh, 155; his character, 166.
- Browne, George, Provincial of the Augustinian Order in England, 19; appointed by Henry VIII., and consecrated Archbishop of Dublin (1535), 19; his proceedings in Ireland, 20; his letter recommending Parliament to be summoned, 20, and Appendix C; speech in the Irish House of Lords on the Supremacy, 23, and Appendix E; he issues in 1538 "a Form of Beads," 31; his conduct at the assembly of the clergy (1551), 39; dies soon after Mary's accession, 53; his character, 53.
- Browne, Peter, Bishop of Cork, 198; his philosophical writings, 199; controversy with Berkeley, 204.
- Butler, Archer, Professor, 283; sermon on Episcopacy, 283.
- CANONS of the Irish Church, framed by the Convocation of 1634, 132; new enacted by the General Synod after disestablishment, 306, 310.
- Catholic Emancipation, intended by Pitt to follow the Union, 240; prevented by George III., 240; not conceded until 1829, 240; consequences of the delay, 241.
- Celtic race, supposed tendency of to ceremonial systems of religion, Appendix II; observations as to, Appendix II.
- Census of 1861 ascertained the religious profession of the inhabitants of Ireland, 252; results, 253; these give an impulse to the movement against the Irish Establishment, 254.
- Charles I. succeeds to the throne in 1625, 122; finds religious dissensions in England, 123; and a different class of troubles in the Irish Church, 125; selects Wentworth, afterwards Earl of Strafford, to govern Ireland, 126; during Charles's reign Irish Rebellion of 1641, 133; civil war, 135.
- Charles II., when restored in 1660, friendly to the Irish Church, 154; replaces it in its former position, 155; appoints to bishoprics vacant at the Restoration, 155; convenes the Irish Parliament, 158; his Irish Act of Uniformity, 1665, 161; revision of the Prayer-book, 163; as revised enacted in Ireland, 163; Acts of Settlement and Explanation, 167.
- Church of Ireland, separated by legislation of the Irish Parliament in 1537 from connexion with the See of Rome, 23; how far this

legislation then operative among the Irish, 25 ; in the Pale it would be respected, 29 ; clergy not disturbed, 33 ; English Prayer-book introduced by Edward VI., 38 ; assembly of clergy in 1551, 39 ; Acts of 1537 relating to the Church repealed by the Irish Parliament under Mary, 54 ; legislation of the Irish Parliament under Elizabeth again separates the Church of Ireland from the See of Rome, 61 ; revised Prayer-book of Elizabeth introduced in the Irish Church, 67 ; eleven Articles of Faith issued under the authority of the Deputy and bishops, 77 ; condition of the Irish Church under Elizabeth, 93 ; its Convocation convened by James I. in 1613, 108 ; Articles of Faith framed by this Convocation, 111 ; condition of the Church at the accession of Charles I., 125 ; acceptance by its Convocation in 1634 of the English XXXIX. Articles, 128 ; its canons, 132 ; its external action forbidden and ceases under the Commonwealth, 138 ; re-established at the Restoration, 154 ; regained under the Act of Settlement property of which it had been deprived by the Commonwealth, 167 ; legislation of James II. injurious to its interests, 170 ; restored to its former position by William and Mary, 171 ; favoured by Anne, 181 ; its condition under George I. 195 ; effect of Methodism on its members, 213 ; origin of the Evangelical party in, 213 ; improvement in its clergy, 214 ; united to the English Church at the union of the kingdoms, 228 ; agitation against it dormant until after 1829, 241 ; but subsequently arises, 243 ; legislation respecting the Church to remove complaints, 244, 245 ; disestablishment of the

Church advocated, 246 ; arguments of its adversaries, 247 ; replies of its defenders, 248 ; hostile proceedings against it delayed until 1861, 252 ; revived after the Census of 1861, 257 ; proceedings in the House of Lords in relation to the Church, 254 ; in the House of Commons, 256 ; disestablishment in 1869, 259 ; Convocation meets after disestablishment, 289 ; it recommends a Convention of bishops, clergy, and laity, to legislate for the Church, 291 ; which is held, and enacts a Constitution for the Church, 294 ; subsequent history of the Church, Chap. XX.

Clergy, Irish, accounts of the condition of, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Appendix W ; not improved before the end of that century, 93 ; unfavourable account of by Strafford and Bramhall, 127 ; character of in time of George I., 195 ; improved at a later date, 214 ; still more improved in the nineteenth century, 265 ; their high character before disestablishment, 273 ; testimonies to, 257, 273 ; their number in 1890, 356.

Commission, Royal, to inquire into revenues, &c., of Irish Church, issued in 1867, 255 ; its Report, 259 ; statistics of Report, Appendix KK.

Commonwealth, ecclesiastical policy of, in Ireland, 138 ; confiscates the lands of its opponents in Ireland, 151 ; transplantation of many natives and Roman Catholic Anglo-Irish to Connaught, 151 ; new settlers introduced, 152 ; these often not friendly to the Church, 152.

Condition of the European Churches at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Appendix A.



- Constitution of the disestablished Church of Ireland, 295.
- Convention of the Irish Church after disestablishment, 293; its duties, 293; met, 294; framed a Constitution for the disestablished Church of Ireland, 294.
- Conversion of the native Irish to Protestantism not attempted under Henry VIII., 28; hindrances to it down to the death of Elizabeth, 81, 96, 97; subsequent attempts for the purpose, 183, 185, 254, and *see* also Appendix II.
- Convocation, none in Ireland before James I., 108; convened by him (1613), 108; it then frames and enacts Articles of Faith differing from the English, 110; in 1634 enacts the English XXXIX. Articles, 129; then also enacts canons, 132; not convened by William and Mary, or by William after Mary's death, 172; summoned by Anne in 1703, and several times afterwards, 183; proceedings of Convocation in Anne's reign, 183; after 1716 Convocation discontinued, 185; first again met after disestablishment, 288, Appendix NN; its proceedings at that time, 290.
- Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, opposes the introduction of the Reformation by Browne, 20; reasons he assigns, 20; dies in Henry's lifetime, 39.
- Curwin, appointed by the Pope, at request of Mary, Archbishop of Dublin, 52, Appendix N; afterwards Chancellor, 71; after Elizabeth's accession supports her ecclesiastical policy, 71, Appendix R; translated from Dublin to Oxford, 73.
- DAVIS, SIR JOHN, 106; Attorney-General in Ireland under James I., 107; Speaker of Irish House of Commons, 107; Address, as Speaker, to Sir Arthur Chichester, Deputy, 107; his eminence, 107, *note*.
- Dioceses of the Church in Ireland, Appendix T; thirty-five in number, *ibid.*; where situate, *ibid.*; unions of some before 1536, *ibid.*; then four Archbishoprics, *ibid.*; subsequent unions, *ibid.*; effect of Temporalities Acts (1833, 1834), on the number and arrangements of dioceses, 288, 289.
- Disestablishment of the Irish Church enacted in 1869, 259; provisions of the statute for the purpose, 260.
- Dowdall, Prior of a Monastery, on the death of Cromer appointed Archbishop of Armagh by Henry VIII., 39; not recognized by the Pope, who appoints Waucop, 39; either resigned or was deprived by Edward VI., 45; restored by Mary, 51; dies before Elizabeth's accession, 332.
- Downham, appointed Bishop of Derry by James I., 119; his sermon on Episcopacy, 119; his treatise on Justification, 267.
- EDITIONS of books referred to in citations, Appendix B.
- Education, exertions for, by Kildare-place Society before 1831, 271; then a Board for National Education formed by Government, 271; characteristics of its system, 271; gives rise to difference of opinion among the clergy, 272.
- Edward VI. succeeds to the throne, January, 1547, 34; his First and Second Prayer-books (*see* under head of Prayer-book); appoints to bishoprics, 45; under him in Ireland events of a civil character not important, 49.

Elizabeth, her accession, 1558, 60 ; her first English and Irish Parliaments pass a new Supremacy Act (*see* Supremacy) ; Acts of her first Irish Parliament (1560), 65 ; how composed, Appendix Q ; assembly of clergy (1560), 70 ; conduct of bishops in office at the accession of Elizabeth considered, 71, Appendix R ; Queen appoints bishops, 73 ; two distinct successions of bishops during her reign, one appointed by herself, the other by the Popes, 74, Appendix S ; the Queen's political measures, 75 ; founds Trinity College, Dublin, 79 ; wars and insurrections in her reign, 81 ; counties then formed, 83 ; colonization, 83.

Elrington, Charles, Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, 273 ; promotes improvement in the teaching of the Divinity School, 273 ; his eminence in theological studies, 273.

Episcopacy, opinions respecting, of Bishop Downham, 119 ; of Archbishop Whitgift, 120, *note* ; of Bacon, 120, *note* ; of Archbishop Ussher, 142 ; of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, 158 ; of Swift, 208 ; of Paley, 222 ; of Whately, 282 ; of Professor Archer Butler, 283, and *see* also Appendix MM.

Episcopate in Ireland, Appendix T ; at time of Reformation, 87 ; appointments to, by Henry VIII., 33, Appendix I ; by Edward VI., 45 ; by Mary, 52 ; conduct of, on Elizabeth's accession, 71, Appendix R : two successions of bishops in this reign, one appointed by the Crown, the other by the Popes, 74 ; names of, Appendix S ; bishops appointed by James before 1613, 109, Appendix BB ; afterwards, 117 ; bishops of Convocation of 1634, 129 ; none appointed during the rule of the Commonwealth,

138 ; eight surviving bishops at the Restoration, 154 ; vacancies filled on the Restoration, 154 ; two archbishops and ten bishops consecrated on 27th January, 1661, 156, Appendix EE ; other appointments then, Appendix EE ; no bishops appointed by James II., 171 ; vacancies filled by William and Mary, 171 ; bishops appointed by Anne, 188 ; in the reigns of George I. and II. bishops appointed from political motives, 196 ; Englishmen preferred, 206 ; these motives govern their selection down to the Union, 214 ; from the Union to disestablishment merit much more considered, 274 ; names of bishops at that time of academic eminence, 274, *note* ; bishops at time of Convocation of 1869, 289, *note* ; bishops how appointed since disestablishment, 298 ; succession continued from Cotton's *Fasti* to the present time, Appendix PP.

Evangelical party, origin of, in England, 213 ; extends to Ireland, 213 ; after Union increases in Ireland in influence, 268 ; character of clergy of, 269 ; compared with Methodism, 269, 270.

FINANCIAL condition of the disestablished Church of Ireland, Appendix OO.

First Fruits, 32, 181.

GENERAL Synod of the Church of Ireland, 296 ; is the authority entitled to legislate for the Church, 296 ; its legislation in reference to the Prayer-book, 306.

George I. and II., the condition of the Church under, 192 ; of society under, 194 ; of the Irish clergy under, 195 ; exercise of

ecclesiastical patronage by, 196 ; Irish and English parties grow up in Ireland in their reigns, 205.

Gladstone proposes suspension of appointments in the Irish Church, 257 ; his testimony to the merits of the Irish clergy, 257 ; Prime Minister, 1869, 259 ; introduces Irish Church Act, 259.

Graves, Dean of Ardagh, 273 ; Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, 1814-1829, 273 ; improves the teaching of the Divinity School, 273 ; his Lectures on the Pentateuch, 285.

HACKET, Bishop of Down and Connor, nearly twenty years absent from his diocese, 175 ; deprived for Simony, &c., in 1694, 175.

Hamilton, Bishop of Clonfert, 1796, of Ossory, 1799, 226.

Henry VIII., being offended by the Pope's conduct in reference to his suit for a divorce from Katherine of Arragon, repudiates the authority of the See of Rome, 9 ; claims to be head of the Church, 11 ; procures from the English Convocations admission of the title with a qualification, 13 ; motives influencing him to desire to have his supremacy acknowledged in Ireland, 18 ; appoints Browne Archbishop of Dublin, 19 ; after Supremacy Act appoints some bishops and confirms others, 33.

Hervey, Earl of Bristol and Bishop of Derry, 216 ; sketch of his history and character, 216.

IMPROPRIATE Tithes, amount of, in Ireland, 89, *note*.

Ireland in the sixteenth century, its relations to England, 17 ; its people separated into two divi-

sions, natives and Anglo-Irish, 20 ; its Parliament under Henry VIII., 21 ; under Elizabeth, Appendix Q ; natives ruled by the Chieftains or great Lords, 319 ; the Irish countries poor and barbarous, 320 ; unfavourable report of their condition in 1517 to Pope Leo X., 320 ; unfavourable report of condition of Pale to Henry VIII., 320 ; want of education among the natives, 98, 342 ; their constant wars, 320, 342.

Irish Church Act, passed in 1869, 259 ; its provisions, 260.

JAMES I. succeeds to the English throne in 1603, 101 ; his policy, 102 ; Plantation of Ulster by, 103 ; Parliament and Convocation convened by, in 1613, 106, 108 ; exercise of his ecclesiastical patronage in Ireland, 117 ; his theological opinions not uniform, 118 ; after Synod of Dort, favours Arminianism, 118 ; effect of his political measures, 121.

James II., desires to establish a Roman Catholic ascendancy in Ireland, 169 ; appoints Tyrconnell Lord Lieutenant, 169 ; is deprived of the Crown in England, 169 ; which then was conferred on his daughter Mary and her husband William, Prince of Orange, 169 ; obtains support from Irish Roman Catholics, 169 ; James lands in Ireland in 1689, with the object of asserting his title to the Crown, 169 ; calls an Irish Parliament, 170 ; Acts of this Parliament, 170 ; these annulled under William, 171.

Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, 279 ; a disciple of Alexander Knox, 279 ; their correspondence, 279 ; merits of Jebb's treatise on Sacred Literature, 279.



- KING, Rev. Robert, his *Primer of Irish Church History*, 285, *note*.
- King, William, Bishop of Derry, translated to Dublin by Anne, 188; his successful administration of his dioceses, 188, 189; his writings considered, 197.
- Kirwan, Dean of Killala, 226; his eloquence, 227.
- Knox, Alexander, 276; had before the Union been Secretary to Lord Castlereagh, 277; turns from public affairs to a life of religious study and contemplation, 278; his *Remains* published after his death, 278; his opinions in relation to "Justification," 278.
- LAURENCE, Archbishop of Cashel, 284; his *Bampton Lectures*, 284.
- Law, John, successively Bishop of Clonfert, Killala, and Elphin, 221; sermon at his consecration preached by Paley, 222; views of Law respecting the relations of the State and Established Church to Roman Catholics in Ireland, 223.
- Leslie, Charles, Chancellor of Connor, Non-Juror, 173; his character as a writer, 173; his treatise entitled "A Short Method with a Deist," 173; his history after the Revolution of 1688, 173, *note*.
- Leverous, Bishop of Kildare, at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, refuses to acknowledge the Supremacy of the Crown, 71; his objections, 71.
- Loftus, appointed Archbishop of Armagh by Queen Elizabeth, 73; translated to Dublin, 73.
- MAGEE, Archbishop of Dublin, 275; his work on the Atonement, 276; eloquence as a preacher, 276, *note*.
- Mahaffy, Professor, his essay on the decay of modern preaching referred to, 269, *note*.
- Mant, Bishop of Down and Connor, 284; his theological writings, 284; his history of the Church of Ireland, 285.
- Margetson, appointed by Charles II, Archbishop of Armagh on Bramhall's death, 166; character, 166.
- Mary, succeeds to the throne (1553), 50; re-establishes the Church of Rome, 51; under her some Irish bishops deprived, 52; in their place she appoints others, 53; on religious grounds no persecution under her in Ireland, 55; it is said persecution was intended when she died, 55, Appendix O; the first Plantation was under her, when the King's and Queen's Counties were formed, 56.
- Methodism, origin of, 211; introduced into Ireland, 211; progress of, 212.
- Molyneux, his treatise entitled "The Case of Ireland being bound by Acts of Parliament in England," 177; excitement caused by this treatise, 177.
- Moriarty, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kerry, his testimony to the merits of the clergy of the Irish Established Church, 273, *note*.
- NEWCOME, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, translated in 1795 to Armagh, 227; his character, 227.
- O'BEIRNE, Bishop of Meath, 225; originally a Roman Catholic, 225; attention to the discipline of his clergy, 225; remarkable charge, 225; at the time of the Union recommends that the Irish Church should not be joined to, but merge in, the English, 236.

O'Brien, Bishop of Ossory, 273 ; previously lecturer in Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, 273 ; his sermons on the Nature and Effects of Faith, published in 1833, 277.

Ordinal, framed after First Prayer-book of Edward VI., 47, Appendix GG.

PALE, the, was in the sixteenth century composed of portions of the counties of Dublin, Meath, Kildare, and Louth, 20 ; its boundary-line defined, Appendix H ; situate in the dioceses of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, and Armagh, 29 ; origin of the name, Appendix H ; condition of in the sixteenth century, 26, Appendix H.

Paley preaches in the Castle Chapel, Dublin, the sermon on the consecration of Bishop Law, 222 (see Law) ; discusses in it the question of Episcopacy, 222.

Parliament of England legislates for Ireland, 176 ; claims authority to do so, 176, Appendix HH ; discontent on that account in Ireland under William III., 177 ; Molyneux's argument against the jurisdiction, 177 ; English Act (6 George I.) asserting the authority of the English Parliament, 228 ; Swift writes against the authority, 230 ; in 1782 the English Parliament concedes the independence of the Irish Parliament, 232 ; union of both Parliaments, 236.

Parliament of Ireland, under Henry VIII., 21 ; convened by Henry VIII. (1536), 22, Appendix D ; enacts Irish Supremacy Act, 23 ; also Acts against appeals, &c., to Rome, 24 ; enacts that the Kings of England shall be not Lords, but Kings of Ireland, 27 ; Parliament not called in the reign of

Edward VI., 49 ; called by Queen Mary, 54 ; it repeals for her Henry's statutes as to the Church, 54 ; meets at the accession of Queen Elizabeth (1560), 65 ; how it was then composed, Appendix Q ; its Acts, 66 ; meets under James I. (1613), 106 ; how it was then composed, 106 ; enactments at that time, 108 ; its independence conceded in 1782, 283 ; its union with the English Parliament in 1800, 228.

Penal Code, begun under William III., 175 ; extended and increased under Anne, 178 ; impolicy of, 179 ; injurious to the progress of the Church, 180.

Percy, Bishop of Dromore, 225 ; his character, 225.

Plunket, Lord, Archbishop of Dublin, account by him of the exertions made for the conversion of Roman Catholics in Ireland, 254, *note*.

Prayer-book, the first English, was framed under Edward VI., and enacted by the English Parliament in 1549, 36 ; introduced into Ireland by direction of the King, 38 ; submitted to an assembly of bishops and clergy by St. Leger, the Deputy, 38 ; was largely from the old liturgies, 40 ; how it differed from the present English Prayer-book, 41 ; the Prayer-book was again revised under Edward VI., 47 ; this revised, or Second Prayer-book of Edward VI., never introduced in the Irish Church, 47 ; how it differed from Edward's First, 47 ; Edward's Second Prayer-book was revised under Queen Elizabeth, 64 ; the use of Elizabeth's revised Prayer-book was enacted by the Irish Parliament, 67 ; James I., of his own authority, made some alterations in Elizabeth's Prayer-book, 162 ;

as altered by him it was again, under Charles II., subjected to a complete revision, 164, Appendix GG; after disestablishment, the Prayer-book of Charles II. was revised by the General Synod of the Irish Church, 306.

Predestination, the Irish Articles respecting, 111; how they differed from the English Article XVII., 113; seem to have followed the later views attributed by Hooker to St. Augustine, Appendix CC; with which appear to agree Aquinas's opinions respecting Predestination, Appendix CC.

Presbyterian clergy, their position in Ireland between the Restoration and the Uniformity Act of Charles II., Appendix FF.

Printing, introduced into Ireland in the reign of Edward VI., 46, Appendix AA.

Protestantism, obstacles to progress of, in Ireland, Appendix II.

Puritanism, in favour with the Irish Church in 1613, 111; previously encouraged in Trinity College, 111; of which the three first Provosts Puritan, 111, *note*.

REBELLION of 1641, 134; loss of life and destruction of property in, 134, Appendix DD.

Reformation, the, in the sixteenth century, extended from Germany to England, 2; causes predisposing to its favourable reception there, 3; Wolsey's policy in reference to, 8; his fall before he could act upon his policy, 8; Reformation favoured by Henry VIII., 9; the King's views were a further development of old enactments, 10; he claims to be *caput ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, 11; this title, with a qualification, conceded by the English Convocations, 13.

Reformation, the, in the sixteenth century, in Ireland did not grow spontaneously, 17, Appendix Y; was introduced by Henry VIII. through Browne, whom he appointed Archbishop of Dublin (1535), 19; supremacy of the Crown in the Church declared by a statute of the Irish Parliament (1537), 23; Staples, then Bishop of Meath, takes the side of the Reformation, 29; Miagh, appointed by Henry to Kildare, does the same, 29; doctrinal Reformation then limited in extent, 80; the Reformation was received unfavourably by the native Irish, 97; with favour by the Anglo-Irish, 99.

Religion of the Irish people, whether natives or Anglo-Irish, at the beginning of the sixteenth century Roman Catholic, 85, Appendix Y; in the fourteenth century Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, had been discontented with the friars, Appendix Y; and Crumpe, a monk, leaned to Protestant views of the Eucharist, Appendix Y; there is no evidence that their opinions survived them, Appendix Y.

Religious Houses in Ireland, except in remote Irish districts, dissolved under Henry VIII., 32; their possessions either retained for the Crown, or granted to laymen, 32, 92; their number and character, 88, Appendix V, X.

Representative Body of the Church of Ireland a corporation, 261; to hold the property of the Church after disestablishment, 261; Charter of, 299; Temporalities' Commissioners empowered to pay over to it the capitalized value of the annuities payable to the clergy, 302; the value, accordingly, was paid over, 303; arrangements of this Body with the parishes



- for contributions, 304; with the clergy for discharge from duty, 304.
- Revision of the Prayer-book by the General Synod of the Irish Church, 306; the course pursued on that occasion by this body explained in a Preface to a new edition of the Prayer-book published under its authority, 307; preceding discussions in the Synod, Appendix QQ; the alterations made in the Prayer-book, Appendix RR.
- Robinson, Archbishop of Armagh, 220; his merits, 220.
- Rundle, Bishop of Derry, 224; his character, 224.
- SARUM, the use of, probably that adopted in the diocese of Dublin before the Reformation, 36; First Prayer-book of Edward VI. founded especially on this use, 40.
- Sidney, Sir Henry, Deputy under Elizabeth, his letter to her in 1566, on the condition of the Irish Church, 93.
- Skelton, Rector of Templecarne, publishes a remonstrance to Bishops Browne and Berkeley on the controversy between them, 205, *note*; his merits, 205, *note*.
- Social condition of Ireland, what it was at the era of the Reformation, 20; districts of the native Irish were then ruled by the Chieftains, or Anglo-Irish Lords, 25; the number of these chiefs and lords, Appendix G; constant wars and insurrections among them, 320; general barbarism of their districts, 320; state of the Pale, 26, Appendix H; low standard of education among the native Irish, 97, 98, Appendix AA.
- Statutes, Irish, of Henry VIII., relating to the Church, 23, Appendix L.
- Stearne, appointed Bishop of Clogher by Anne, 189; his character, 189.
- St. Leger, Deputy under Edward VI., 38; convenes an assembly of the Irish clergy, and submits to them the English Prayer-book, 39; meeting of them held at which he presides, 39, Appendix M; also Deputy under Elizabeth, 72, *note*.
- Stone, Archbishop of Armagh, 214; sketch of his history and character, 215.
- Stokes, Professor, his treatises on the early history of the Irish Church, 285, *note*.
- Strafford, sent to govern Ireland by Charles I., 126; his measures in relation to the Church, 127; desires to have the XXXIX. Articles accepted by the Irish Convocation, 130; refuses to permit alteration in them, 130; a statute preventing waste of Church property obtained by him from the Irish Parliament, 132.
- Succession of bishops in Ireland, twofold from the accession of Queen Elizabeth, one set of bishops being appointed by the Crown, and the other by the Popes, 74, Appendix S; names of the bishops of each succession during Elizabeth's reign, Appendix S.
- Supremacy of the Crown in the Churches of England and Ireland, was enacted under Henry VIII. by both the English and Irish Parliaments, 15, 23; the King "Head of the Church on earth," 11; this title not intended to imply a spiritual character in the King, 12; under Mary Henry's Supremacy Acts were repealed, 54; Queen Elizabeth's Supremacy Act (1560), 61; she objects to be called "Head of the Church," 62; the word "Governor" was substituted for "Head of the Church,"

- 62, 66; explanation of the Supremacy in certain Injunctions issued by the Queen, 63; also in Article XXXVII. of the XXXIX. Articles, 63; Act defines heresy, 62, 66; the Supremacy considered in Appendix, Note P.
- Surplus of the property vested in the Temporalities' Commissioners by the Irish Church Act of 1869 remaining after meeting the obligations imposed upon it by that Act, Appendix LL; subsequent dealings with this surplus by Parliament, Appendix LL; what charges now affect this surplus, Appendix LL.
- Sussex, Lord, Deputy under Elizabeth, an assembly of bishops and clergy convened by and held under him, 70, Appendix Q.
- Swift, first becomes prominent under Anne, 181; entrusted with the conduct of an application for remission of First Fruits and Twentieths to the Irish Church, 181; appointed Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, by Anne, 207; assumes the lead of the Irish party in Ireland, 207; his influence, 207; excites an agitation against English supremacy in Ireland in connexion with Wood's copper coinage, 230; Swift's theological writings, 207.
- TAYLOR, JEREMY, appointed Bishop of Down and Connor immediately after the Restoration, 156; his eloquence, 156; character of his writings, 157; the first Divine to advocate toleration, 157; his sermon at the consecration of 1661, 158; sermon before Parliament, 159; sermon on Faith, 267.
- Tithes in Ireland, enforced from the English Invasion, 88; doubtful, if they were usually paid before, 88; payment of, ordered at the Synod of Cashel, 1172, Appendix U; when collected in kind difficult to levy, 218, *note*; unpopularity of the tithe system, 243; agitation against their collection, 243; composition for, 244; converted into rentcharges payable by the landlords, 245.
- Transplantation, under the Commonwealth, to Connaught, 152; motives for, 152, *note*.
- Trinity College, Dublin, founded by Queen Elizabeth, 79; empowered to grant degrees, 80; in the next reign treated as an University, 80, *note*.
- Tractarian movement, 279; *Tracts for the Times*, 279; influence of, in England, 279; tractarian movement found no favour in the Church of Ireland, 280; disapproved by the Irish bishops, 280; the Tracts answered in the *Cautions for the Times*, written by Archbishop Whately and other ecclesiastics of the Church of Ireland, 280.
- UNIFORMITY, Irish Act of, 17 & 18 Charles II., c. 6, 161; passed in 1665, 161.
- Union of Great Britain and Ireland, enacted in 1800, 228; also of the Churches of England and Ireland, 228; previous relations of the English or British and Irish Parliaments, 228, *et seq.*; Act of Union, 236.
- Ussher, James, Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin, in 1613, 112; to him the draft of the Articles enacted by the Irish Convocation in 1615 attributed, 112; appointed by James I. Bishop of Meath (1621), Archbishop of Armagh (1625), 117; sketch of his life and opinions, 140; his character, 147.

- WALSH, Bishop of Meath at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, refuses to adopt the English Prayer-book, 70; deprived, 71.
- Webb, Professor, his essays under the title of "Isis" discuss the Idealism of Berkeley, 202, *note*.
- Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, 280; publishes *Cautions for the Times* in answer to the Oxford Tracts, 280; assisted in them by Fitz Gerald, afterwards Bishop of Killaloe, 280; his character as a theological writer, 281; his opinions as to Predestination, 281; as to Episcopacy, 282.
- William and Mary, fill bishoprics left vacant by James II., 171;
- Convocation in Ireland not summoned from the Revolution of 1688 until the reign of Anne, 172; laws relating to the Church enacted under William III., 174; the Irish Parliament meets in 1692, 175; its policy from that time down to the death of William, 175.
- Wolsey, Cardinal, seeks to reform the English Church, 8; his fall from power before his policy could be developed, 8.
- YOUNG, Bishop of Clonfert, 1799, 226; his character, 226.

THE END.







13332. HEcclir.

Author Ball, J[ohn] T[homas] B.

Title The Reformed Church of Ireland, (1537-1889).

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
LIBRARY

Do not  
remove  
the card  
from this  
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU



